

Also, resolution No. 1, American National Live Stock Association, of Denver, Colo., relative to furnishing cars to transport live stock and other perishable freight and to give prompt and efficient service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of American National Live Stock Association, of Denver, Colo., urging the creation of a nonpartisan tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American National Live Stock Association, of Denver, Colo., urging increased appropriation for Bureau of Animal Industry—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Company H, Second Infantry, Connecticut National Guard, of Middletown, for the militia bill—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of Municipal Civil Service Board, of New Haven, Conn., against the Crumpacker bill (H. R. 7597)—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of Red Wing (Minn.) Commercial Club, for Davis bill, providing appropriation for agricultural high schools, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STURGISS: Petition of George W. Mayfield and others, for national highways commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Lumber Dealers' Association of New Haven, Conn., for forest reservations in White Mountains and southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance, against liquor prohibition legislation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Petition of 150 citizens of Lima, Allen County, Ohio, representing the First Evangelical Lutheran congregation, for the Littlefield original-package bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Gibson Grange, No. 692, Mercer County, Ohio, for a national highways commission and for national aid in building highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of Julius Schlaich and other soldiers of the civil war, for a volunteer officers' retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of mass meeting, under auspices of Clan-na-Gael, at Bijou Theater, Brooklyn, February 23, 1908, against ratification of any treaty of arbitration with Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 29, 1908.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following report from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 247.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House for the services of an assistant clerk to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds compensation at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, until otherwise provided for by law.

With the following committee amendment:

Amend, in line 4, by striking out the word "eight" and inserting the word "two," so that it will read \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CLERK TO COMMITTEES UNDER RULE XI.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I now desire to call up House Resolution No. 268, which has been printed in the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 268.

In lieu of H. Res. No. 175, H. Res. No. 176, H. Res. No. 177, H. Res. No. 178, H. Res. No. 179, H. Res. No. 182, H. Res. No. 184, H. Res. No. 185, and H. Res. No. 186.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House for the services of a clerk to each of the committees whose jurisdiction is defined in clauses 42 to 52, inclusive, Rule XI, compensation at the rate of \$6 per day each during the remainder of the present session.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I now yield, Mr. Speaker, five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL].

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Speaker, little can be added to the full

and interesting report made by the chairman of the Committee on Accounts. This much, however, may be added thereto. A statement of the history and powers given under the rule to these committees should be sufficient for the information of the House. In other words, these committees have fallen, during recent years, into a condition of desuetude that, in the opinion of those who have looked into the matter, is anything but innocuous.

They first were established in 1816 when Henry St. George Tucker, of Virginia, brought in a resolution providing for these standing committees of the House with power provided in the resolution. On the debate on that resolution, which is contained in the Annals of Congress, volume 14, part 1, page 1298, Mr. Smith, of Maryland, in opposing the resolution, said:

Mr. Smith of Maryland did not believe that much good could flow out of the measure. There were already, he said, an accountant of the War and an accountant of the Navy Departments, and a comptroller over them, and now we are to appoint committees of Congress over the whole, to inspect accounts after the money has been paid away. Furthermore, he thought it would be impracticable for the committees to act efficiently unless they sat all the year. Mr. Smith said he remembered that a gentleman of this House [Mr. Randolph] once moved a similar investigation into what was called the Augean stable; the inquiry was ordered; the gentleman went into it; \$5,000 were spent in printing documents, etc., and, after all, there was not even a resolution or any other proceeding predicated on the examination.

The motion was advocated by Messrs. Tucker, Desha, Stanford, Wright, and Lowndes, by whom it was argued that the experience of other States, particularly Virginia, proved the utility of such committees; that they were also found extremely beneficial and useful in England; that clamors and suspicions had gone abroad, and though they might not be well founded, still they rendered the inquiry necessary; that if anything was wrong in the public accounts, the Government ought to know it and the evil be corrected; that if the committees only entered into a general, and not a minute and detailed investigation, of these accounts much good would still result from it, as it would tend to correct frauds, or errors, if any; that it was the duty of this branch of the Government to inspect the money concerns and see that they were correctly and faithfully conducted.

The resolutions were then agreed to, establishing these committees on expenditure in the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of War, the Department of the Navy, the Post-Office Department, a Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.

In 1860 the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department was created, and in 1874 the Department of Justice, and in 1889 the Department of Agriculture, and when the Department of Commerce and Labor was established a committee was provided for that Department.

Now, let me call the attention of the House to the powers given to these committees under the rules of the House. In Rule XI, section 42, it is provided that: All proposed legislation shall be referred to these committees on expenditure relating to the examination of the accounts and expenditures of the several Departments of the Government and the manner of keeping the same. The economy, justice, and correctness of such expenditures; their conformity with appropriation laws; the proper application of public moneys; the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands; retrenchment; enforcement of the payment of moneys due the United States; the economy and accountability of public officers; the abolishment of useless offices; the reduction or increase of the pay of officers, shall all be subject within the jurisdiction of the nine standing committees on the public expenditures in the several Departments, as follows—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I grant five minutes more time to the gentleman.

Mr. BOUTELL. It will be seen, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the scope and functions of these committees are as important and as large as those of any of the standing committees of the House. I have not served long enough in this House to know when these committees cease to act as organized working committees. I know that in this session I found myself placed for the first time upon the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department, and I found upon examining the rules what the powers of that committee were. I found also that the committee had never in recent years been organized and no work had been done by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unless I am mistaken, in another branch of the Government, at the other end of the Capitol, some time ago the statement was made that the Federal Government had upon its rolls 3,000 special agents of various sorts—a sort of detective force. Does that not fall within the scope or authority of these committees, to examine whether or not these various special agents are being paid under any law of Congress, and whether their appointment has been authorized by any law of Congress, and whether the money used to pay them is properly paid or not?

Mr. BOUTELL. That would fall specifically within the letter of clause 42, of Rule XI, describing the functions of these expenditure committees, and it is information which this House and which this country ought to have. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I found out that so far as the committee to which I was appointed was concerned, it was an unorganized committee and not doing any work. Upon looking up the history of these committees I found not only the account given of their origin that I have read, but that under previous Congresses these committees exercised a powerful influence in this House on legislation and on the conduct of the Departments.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOUTELL. With pleasure.

Mr. MANN. Can the gentleman tell us whether, because of the great work which these committees have done and can do in this House, the Senate has recently created like committees in the Senate?

Mr. BOUTELL. My impression is that the creation of like committees in the Senate proceeds from the same spirit that has animated, I may say, the leaders of this House to put these committees on a working basis to properly scrutinize the expenditures of various Executive Departments, and to examine and report to this House the reasons for the rapidly increasing appropriations and expenditures.

Mr. MANN. My understanding is that the Senate has recently created corresponding committees in the Senate, to each of which is assigned a clerk at \$2,240 a year.

Mr. BOUTELL. Continuing, Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to allude to one instance of the important work done by these committees. In 1876, when William R. Morrison, of Illinois, was the leader of this House, then in control of the Democratic party, a report was made to this House on a number of resolutions which had been referred to the Ways and Means Committee, asking for a report on the expenditure of the various Departments of the Government. These committees were authorized to employ such clerical and stenographic help as was necessary; examinations were made, and upon the report of one of those committees, namely, the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, a state of things not at all creditable to the Department was shown in the expenditures of that Department, and upon that was based the impeachment of the Secretary of War.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I do not know what influences have led to these committees falling into a condition of inaction. I do say, however, that so far as I am personally concerned, I do not care to serve upon any committee of this House which has vested in it the powers contained in the rule which I have read, and not have that committee organized and prepared to do work. I sympathize fully with the desire of the Speaker of the House to have these committees placed upon a working basis. The way to place a committee upon a working basis is to give it the clerical force necessary to attend to the business of the committee. There are scores of bills relating to the expenditures of money in the various Departments, to increases in salaries, which are now referred to other committees, simply because these committees are unorganized committees.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that these committees have quite a large jurisdiction and are capable of doing a great deal toward improving administration if they become active. I was a member of one of these committees during my first term of Congress. I never found out where the committee room was. We never had a meeting, but perhaps that was the fault of the committee. If I can feel assured that these committees are sort of having a general revival along the right lines, I think they ought to have the clerks, and I understand that the committees are taking hold of their work and are investigating along lines that perhaps need investigation. I may assume that from what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] says, and that being the case, I think the committees ought to have the clerks, and if any committee is assigned a clerk and never has a meeting in the future, why the Congress can rescind the order, I suppose.

Mr. BOUTELL. I think I may safely say in reply to the gentleman from Indiana that the principle of noblesse oblige would influence every member of these committees in the conduct of the business; but, sir, you can not expect members of a committee unorganized from whom bills which belong to it are taken will show any great interest in the work of the committee, but if these committees are recognized by the Speaker of the House in the reference of bills and are given the clerical help necessary to do the work I think we may expect great benefits to result from the scrutinizing of the accounts of the Departments and proposed legislation to increase salaries, instead of allowing them to be taken up on appropriation bills where they

are subject to points of order. The revitalization of these committees, I may say, would be of great relief to all the appropriation committees of the House.

Mr. ADAIR. I just want to ask the question whether or not the fact this committee has been inactive and has never performed any service was due to the fact that it had no clerk? You have stated this committee has been inactive. You have also stated this committee has power to act, but has not acted. Now, was it due to the fact you had no clerk to this committee?

Mr. BOUTELL. As I stated, this is my first service on one of these committees, and during my eleven years' service in the House these committees have never been active committees. Whether you say the committees have been inactive because of the fact they have had no clerk, or whether they have no clerk because they were inactive, it is difficult to say. The reason is one which some of the older Members of the House may be able to give, but which I can only surmise, and therefore do not care to state. These committees have fallen into a condition of inactivity, and there have been no auditing or examining committees active in this House for many years, and therefore, contrary to the wording of the rule, bills which should go to these committees have been referred to other committees.

Mr. ADAIR. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that this is a very important committee, and I believe that it should have a clerk, and I believe the sum asked is reasonable. I am heartily in favor of the resolution because I believe that all of these bills on these questions should go before these committees before they are acted upon by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. May I ask the gentleman a question? I want to ask the gentleman a question to see if my memory is correct. I recollect that in the Fifty-eighth Congress, when there was a great deal of scandal reported in the papers in the Post-Office Department, a number of resolutions were introduced providing for inquiries.

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. And those resolutions were referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, and were subsequently, by action of the House, taken from that committee and referred to another committee. That is correct, is it?

Mr. BOUTELL. I think the gentleman from Mississippi is correct; but, as everyone in the House felt at that time, those resolutions, with the entire investigation made at that time, should, under the rule, have been in charge of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, and it was just on account of the reasons I have stated—that these committees have fallen into inactivity—that matters which rightfully and logically belonged to that committee were taken up and passed upon by a committee to which they did not logically belong, namely, the committee that appropriated the very funds about which the investigation was asked. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois, first, whether any bills have been referred at this session of Congress to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Speaker, I can not say how many other bills have been referred that have not reached this committee, but as showing the scope of this committee's work as understood by the House I will refer to House resolution No. 13, introduced on the first day of the session by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], which is as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department is hereby authorized and directed to examine, so far as the Navy Department is concerned, all of the matters referred to in paragraph 42 of Rule XI of the House of Representatives, and for that purpose it may send for and examine persons and papers and administer oaths; and said committee is authorized to employ a competent stenographer while conducting said examination, and to sit during the sessions of the House, and to report the result of its examination, with any recommendations, to the House.

That resolution was introduced before the House was organized or the committees were appointed and shows clearly a desire on the part of some gentlemen on that side of the House to have this investigation done, and that resolution has been referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman this: Is it his conception of the rules that all expenditures in reference to the Department shall come before these committees on expenditures? In other words, that the fixing of salaries in the Navy Department, or the increase or the reduction of salaries in the Navy Department, should come before his committee; if that his conception?

Mr. BOUTELL. They come before the committee, under the rules, specifically.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman if

the reason why this class of legislation has not come before the committee in years past is that it has been legislated for on appropriation bills? Is that the case?

Mr. BOUTELL. As I say, it needs an older man in service in the House than I am to give the reason; but I can, at least, surmise that that was one of the reasons.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman this: If we give these committees the clerks they ask for, so that they may go into action and perform their duties as fixed by the rules, I want to know whether these committees are going to protect their own jurisdiction and stop all legislation on appropriation bills in the future that belongs to the jurisdiction of these committees on expenditures?

Mr. BOUTELL. I think I can well assure the gentleman from Alabama, from my knowledge of the membership of this House, that these committees, if given the opportunity to work, will do their work well.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, I would like to ask my friend from Illinois, for whom I have the utmost respect and in whom I have the highest confidence, that if he is given jurisdiction of this matter, and the House recognizes it by giving him a clerk and actively commissioning his committee, he intends to protect the jurisdiction of that committee?

Mr. BOUTELL. Absolutely.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I will vote for his proposition.

Mr. BOUTELL. One of the first measures we will consider, and one I am very sure that my colleague [Mr. Foss], the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, would be glad to be rid of, is the bill H. R. 16959, equalizing certain salaries in the Navy Department.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that I think one of the most vicious practices that exists in the House of Representatives to-day is general legislation on appropriation bills, especially in reference to increasing salaries. There has never been any decrease that I ever heard of, but, I think, in increasing the salaries the question of decreasing salaries should be considered, too. That never comes on an appropriation bill, and if these committees will assume the jurisdiction that belongs to them and prevent this legislation on appropriation bills, I think they will do a great service to the House of Representatives and to the country.

Mr. BOUTELL. I am very glad to hear that expression from the gentleman from Alabama, who has had such long experience in this House. The revitalizing of these committees is expressly for that purpose—to take care of these legislation bills and of this auditing and examination business.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to a question?

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Is the gentleman from Illinois familiar with the other committees affected by this proposed resolution, as to the number of bills referred to them?

Mr. BOUTELL. I simply know in a general way that probably an equal or greater number of bills than are pending before the committee of which I am the chairman are pending before these other committees. Or, if not pending, I will say to the gentleman from New York, will be pending before those committee re-referred from other committees if these committees are given power to act.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman answer another question?

Mr. BOUTELL. With pleasure.

Mr. GOULDEN. Is the gentleman familiar with the work done by the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, and whether that was not good work and well done by the committee presided over by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD]?

Mr. BOUTELL. My understanding is that most excellent and valuable work was done by that committee, and the report made to this House was of great assistance to the membership of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the Fifty-ninth Congress I had the good fortune to be assigned to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor, and I immediately began an investigation of the history and duties of all the committees on expenditures in the various Departments.

During the first session of that Congress the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD], chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, introduced a resolution authorizing that committee to send for papers and

all necessary witnesses. That resolution was referred to the Committee on Accounts. The Committee on Accounts reported favorably and an investigation was begun. Immediately thereafter the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor introduced a similar resolution, and for some reason it was referred to the Committee on Rules, which committee never favorably reported the resolution. Then I introduced resolutions empowering all the other committees on expenditures in the various Departments to make similar investigations, and those resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules. These resolutions were all permitted to lie in the Committee on Rules and were given no favorable consideration. I reintroduced them on the first day of the present session.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What is the explanation of the reference of the resolutions to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can not see any explanation. You would have to consult the Speaker as to that. The probability is that no investigation of these Departments was desired.

Mr. DALZELL. Let me ask the gentleman if he is talking about this Congress or a previous Congress?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Fifty-ninth Congress. The resolution was permitted to go through for the investigation of the Agricultural Department, that resolution having been referred to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, I will say to the gentleman that these resolutions were not reported, not because of any disinclination on the part of the committee, but because they were not pressed. Resolutions that go to the committee and nobody says anything about them thereafter do not usually come out. The committee is not like the ordinary committees, having regular meetings once or twice a week. It meets when somebody wants it to meet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the short session of the Fifty-ninth Congress I addressed the House on this subject and made a plea for the restoration of these committees. Many Members who are around me now will recall the appeal I made to the House at the beginning of the short session for the revival of these committees and the restoration of their powers, and I think the attention of the Committee on Rules was sufficiently directed to the matter. The chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor [Mr. FOSTER of Vermont] made a vigorous effort to have his resolution considered. There are no committees in this House which can be of greater service to the House and the people than the committees for the investigation of the expenditures of the various Departments. Not only ought they to have clerks, but they should be permitted to send for persons and papers and to have the necessary stenographers and power to examine witnesses. The expenditures of the Government are getting beyond our reach. The estimates are for hundreds of millions beyond the revenue, and there is no way in which this House can obtain an understanding of Federal expenditures more effectually than through a revival of these committees.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman explain why it is necessary to have a resolution referred to either the Committee on Accounts or the Committee on Rules for a committee to transact its business?

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the committee is to do the work effectually they will have to have judicial powers.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; not at all. Every officer of the Government is subject to a call by any committee of Congress. We maintain committee stenographers to do that work, and no resolution is necessary to get a stenographer. Any committee can call upon the committee stenographers and get them at any time they are needed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Whenever committees are appointed by this House to investigate they are given power to send for persons and papers and to examine witnesses. These committees on expenditures have powers different from those of other committees. If they have any powers at all they should have the power to investigate the records and power to examine witnesses, and unless you give such powers to them by special resolution they would not be able to carry on the investigations.

Mr. MANN. Why, Mr. Speaker, I have been on committees in Congress for ten years that have examined witnesses continuously and never asked the House for any power—the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Elections and the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have they power to administer oaths?

Mr. MANN. Why, certainly they have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And power to compel the attendance of witnesses?

Mr. MANN. When it comes to the compelling of witnesses

that is a different proposition. These committees have power to compel the officials of the Government to appear before them; and whenever any of them shall find an officer declines to appear before that committee, I apprehend there will be no difficulty in obtaining a resolution of the House to compel attendance. All that is necessary is for one of these committees to notify the officer in advance that he is wanted, and they do not need the power to compel any one of these officers to appear before the committee. So that is not an answer and it is no argument. Every committee secures the attendance of officers of the Government before it. In these committees which the gentleman wants to revivify—I do not know whether he is a member of one of them—all he would have to do would be to introduce a resolution which would preferably be referable to that committee, and it could proceed to use that power.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will ask the gentleman why the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] considered it necessary to have a resolution of this kind before he could make the necessary investigation? He is one of the ablest lawyers in this House or in the country.

Mr. MANN. He did not consider it necessary before he made the investigation. He did not bring in the resolution until after he had commenced the investigation, and did it then only because, as I take it, he wanted to have a special stenographer for the use of his committee, and there was not any good reason for that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman from Maine is here, and I will ask him why it was he wanted this power?

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I was going to answer the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. SCOTT. I will yield to the gentleman from Maine for that purpose.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture did not begin his investigation until all the resolutions introduced by the chairman of that committee were adopted by the House, and the chairman of that committee introduced a resolution authorizing that committee to conduct its examinations by the administering of oaths to the witnesses because he felt that it was a matter of considerable doubt under the rules whether he had any authority to administer an oath to a witness that came before him; and, in order to be sure about it and know that he had the authority, he thought it was necessary to get the resolution through; and after getting it through the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture proceeded with its investigations. I think that answers the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois. I will not say, as an absolute legal proposition, that it was necessary, but I thought it was a necessary and a wise precaution.

Mr. SCOTT. Since I have been a Member of this House the only committee on expenditures which has exercised its functions has been the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, and my membership on the Committee on Agriculture has placed me in a position to testify to the effectiveness and the good results that followed that work. I think I can say that the Department of Agriculture is managed with as excellent business judgment as any Department of our Government, and that the Committee on Agriculture exercises as careful scrutiny over the expenditures of that Department as any general committee of this House is likely to exercise over any Department of the Government. And yet the work that was done by the committee so ably presided over by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] was such as to result in very important changes for the better in the management of the business of the Department of Agriculture, and to make important and valuable suggestions to the Committee on Agriculture. I am thoroughly of the opinion that no committee in this House could be of greater business value to the country than the committees on expenditures in the various Departments if they would actively and effectually exercise the functions which the rules give them.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I wish to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SPERRY] to offer an amendment.

Mr. SPERRY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend as follows:

"That the chairman of the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic is hereby authorized to appoint a clerk to said committee to serve during the sessions of the Sixtieth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of \$6 a day."

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I wish to say, with reference to that amendment, that I hope the House will not adopt it. In considering the resolution that we brought in here for clerks to the expenditures committees, the Committee on Accounts have made an investigation and feel that those committees are entitled to this service. There is a resolution, I think, pending before the Committee on Accounts in reference to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, but that resolution has not been considered or the needs of the committee investigated, and therefore I hope the House will vote down this amendment. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. SPERRY. I wish the gentleman would yield to me to make a statement in reference to this amendment.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. How much time does the gentleman require?

Mr. SPERRY. Only a few minutes.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SPERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we have a committee, although it has not been organized, and there is plenty of business before it. There was a great deal of business before it last year; over 200 letters were received which had to be answered by somebody, and I was obliged to allow my private secretary to answer them. Now, it rests with the Members of the House to say whether the business before that committee shall lie there without being attended to or whether we shall have this clerk, organize the committee, and attend to the business that is legitimately before that committee.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] five minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want first to call attention to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SPERRY]. It provides for a clerk to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic "for the sessions of this Congress." The Committee on Accounts has reported a resolution giving a clerk to these ten committees on expenditures in the various Departments of the Government for this session only. The provision for the clerk made by the resolution will expire by law on the 1st of June, unless Congress adjourns earlier. If we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, you will give him and that committee a clerk for a longer time than you do all these other ten committees. I do not see the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], who is chairman of the Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics; but I have no doubt if he were present, he would offer an amendment to give that committee a clerk; and when you have done that, all the committees of the House will be provided with a clerk during the sessions of Congress.

I do not know that I can add anything to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] has so well stated in reference to these committees. I have no doubt that there will be one or two of the committees to which clerks are assigned that will do some work. We have evidence of that by the fact that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD], the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department, and that committee have done some very valuable work. We have the word of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] that the committee of which he is chairman will begin to do work, and we know from the gentleman's reputation and character that that work will be well done and will be valuable. Beyond that I do not see anybody that proposes to do any work. As far as I am concerned, as long as I have been a member of the Committee on Accounts I have endeavored to see that the money of the Government was not needlessly wasted; and at the same time I have endeavored to see that the necessities of the House and the necessities of the members of the committees and the chairmen of the committees in the discharge of their work should be well supplied from the contingent fund of the House where it is not otherwise supplied.

Now, I have not made a minority report, and I am not here to resist the adoption of the resolution, if the House wants in its wisdom to pass it, but I do not believe that all ten committees are to do the work that one of them has done or that one or two more may do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor is anxious that his committee should begin work, and the members of the committee are anxious to begin work.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. That is the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. FOSTER]. Well, I will include that committee. I have no doubt the gentleman from Vermont will proceed, for I know that he is interested and appeared before the committee.

I have no doubt that if the committees would do the work that it was intended for them to do, it would be of great service to the House and to the country. In the impeachment of Secretary Belknap it started from an investigation of a committee over which Senator Blackburn, then a Member of the House, presided. His examination into the affairs of the expenditures of the War Department developed a condition of affairs which resulted in the impeachment and forced resignation of the Secretary of War. I have no doubt that if the committees of the House and the committees of the Senate on the expenditures of the Government in the various Departments would go to investigating the expenditures of the Government, it would save millions and millions of dollars a year. But it has not been done, as a great many other things have not been done in this almost universal conduct of the Government by the Republican party since 1860.

I am not here to oppose the resolution, and I do not desire to put my will or my views in the way of the accommodation of the House. I shall not vote for the resolution as it is, nor shall I vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut; because if you are going to put the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic on this resolution, you might as well put the Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics on too. It is not justice to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], who is not present, to take care of this Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic and not take care of the Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics. I certainly shall not vote for this amendment, which provides a clerk for both sessions of Congress, when the resolution simply provides for clerks of these other committees for this session.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MANN. Two or three minutes.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word with reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SPERRY], the chairman of the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic. In the course of the investigation which I have had to make in reference to the different committees and the moving of the committees I learned that a very large share of the public at large assumes that the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic had control of the bills relating to that subject in the House, and we all know that during the last two years there have been some bills pending before Congress which have excited a lively interest on the part of many of the people in the country. The result has been that the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, as was shown to me, has been flooded with letters and various communications relating to the legislation before the House. The result of this is that the chairman of that committee is at present compelled, with the clerk that he has given to him personally, not only to attend to his personal and official correspondence relating to his own work, but required in addition to attend to the correspondence concerning the subject of the alcoholic liquor traffic relating to the work of Congress. It seems to me that that is an injustice to him. He is one of the oldest Members of the House, not quite so lively and spry as my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPARD] and many others of the House, and it seems to me that if we are increasing the number of clerks to committees at this time, which we may well do in the interest of the public service, we might also give to that committee, for the purpose of helping to do the work which the public, at least, assumes that the committee does, and carrying on the correspondence which the chairman of the committee is obliged to carry on by reason of his chairmanship—that we might also give to the senior Member of the House, as it were, that additional clerk.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say for the information of the House that the resolution reported from the Committee on Accounts, No. 268, provides for a clerk at \$6 a day to these different committees on expenditures in the Executive Departments from the time of the passage of the resolution to the end of the present session of Congress, and that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SPERRY] provides for the employment of a clerk to his committee for the sessions of the Sixtieth Congress; his amendment seeks to do more for his committee than does the original for the expenditure committees, and on this account I hope that this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. SPERRY. But he would have to be attending to all of that business, and he ought to be paid for it.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. That may be true; but the more orderly procedure would be to consider the gentleman's proposition separately and on its own merits, apart from

the pending resolution, to which the Committee on Accounts has given very careful consideration. Resolution 268, which we have offered, provides for a clerk at \$6 a day from the time of the passage of the resolution to the end of the present session. We limit its operation to this session, believing that before adjournment the several committees on expenditures will have had time enough in which to demonstrate or not their usefulness. The Committee on Accounts were convinced that those committees intend to perform their proper functions if given this clerical assistance. There has been no evidence of that kind before us with respect to the few other committees, including that of the gentleman from Connecticut, which are regarded as inactive committees. I move the previous question on the resolution and amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution and amendment to its final passage.

The question was taken and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia) there were—ayes 61, noes 42.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

REPRINT OF BILL.

By unanimous consent leave was granted to Mr. MARSHALL for a reprint of the bill (H. R. 17824) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or unlabeled paint, turpentine, or linseed oil.

ESTABLISHING A MONETARY SYSTEM.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. PRINCE rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I yield for the submission of a report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PRINCE. If the gentleman from Iowa will yield to me I will make a report.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The trouble is I have had five applications to hold the motion back, and if I yield to one—however, I am perfectly willing to yield to the gentleman to make a report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois desires to ask unanimous consent, as he informed the Chair, touching a report.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I have no objection.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to file his report in favor of the bill H. R. 12677. It was agreed by the committee, Mr. Speaker, that the minority should have ten days in which to file their views, and I ask that they be permitted that length of time in which to file their views.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the minority, as indicated, may have ten days' leave in which to file the views of the minority. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSE ROOMS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report from the Select Committee on Distribution of House Rooms.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa withhold his motion?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I withhold it until the report is presented.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the following privileged report, the title of which the Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

From the Select Committee on Distribution of House Rooms.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman desires to have this report printed in the Record. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

House resolution 269.

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Distribution of House Rooms, reported the following resolution:

Resolved, That the following assignment of rooms be, and the same is hereby, made, to wit:

For the use of the police in the House Office Building, the room north of and adjoining room permanent No. 185.

To the Committee on the District of Columbia, rooms in the House Office Building permanent Nos. 375, 377, and 377a.

To the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, the room in the Capitol formerly occupied by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

To the Committee on Military Affairs, the room heretofore occupied by the Committee on the District of Columbia and the room in the Capitol formerly occupied by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, said rooms to be properly connected.

To the Committee on Ways and Means, the room heretofore occupied by the Committee on Military Affairs.

To the Committee on Printing, the rooms in the Capitol formerly occupied by the Committee on the Territories and the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, said rooms to be properly connected.

To the Committee on Indian Affairs, as additional room, the space heretofore occupied by the Committee on Printing.

To the Journal index clerk, the room in the Capitol formerly occupied by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Resolved further, That the small room at the end of the corridor, heretofore occupied by the Committee on the District of Columbia, be abolished and the space restored as part of the corridor.

House report 1127.

Mr. MANN, from the Select Committee on Distribution of House Rooms, submitted the following report to accompany H. Res. 269:

The special committee which was directed to report to the House plans for the distribution of rooms in the House Office Building and the redistribution of rooms under the control of the House in the Capitol building, beg leave to make a further partial report and to recommend the adoption of the following resolution, to wit:

Resolved, That the following assignment of rooms be, and the same is hereby, made, to wit:

For the use of the police in the House Office Building, the room north of and adjoining room permanent No. 185.

To the Committee on the District of Columbia, rooms in the House Office Building permanent Nos. 375, 377, and 377a.

To the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, the room in the Capitol formerly occupied by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

To the Committee on Military Affairs, the room heretofore occupied by the Committee on the District of Columbia and the room in the Capitol formerly occupied by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, said rooms to be properly connected.

To the Committee on Ways and Means, the room heretofore occupied by the Committee on Military Affairs.

To the Committee on Printing, the rooms in the Capitol formerly occupied by the Committee on the Territories and the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, said rooms to be properly connected.

To the Committee on Indian Affairs, as additional room, the space heretofore occupied by the Committee on Printing.

To the Journal index clerk, the room in the Capitol formerly occupied by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Resolved further, That the small room at the end of the corridor heretofore occupied by the Committee on the District of Columbia be abolished and the space restored as part of the corridor.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

JAMES R. MANN.
JOSEPH H. GAINES.
H. O. YOUNG.
JAMES T. LLOYD.
W. C. ADAMSON.

Mr. CRAIG rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CRAIG. I desire to ask the gentleman from Iowa to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I declined to yield to my colleague from Illinois for that purpose and I can not yield now.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Then, on motion of Mr. HULL of Iowa, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 17288, the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose last evening a point of order had been reserved.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I stated yesterday sales to officers and men ought to have 10 per cent added to price of commissary stores, and I desire to correct that statement. The law which was approved July 5, 1884 (23 Stat. L., p. 108), provides "that hereafter all sales of subsistence and supplies to officers and enlisted men shall be made at cost price only." So it is now sold at flat cost price. The gentleman from Illinois requested that I would give him information about how much this so-called "coffee" money would amount to. It amounts to exactly 21 cents a day per man while en route, and of course the amount could be only figured by the number of men and the distance they traveled; but it is fixed at 21 cents per day per man. There is a new provision in here that I did not call attention to yesterday in regard to extra-duty pay to cooks, on page 25 of the bill. That is only at four recruiting stations. The men are now issued their rations, and the only money they have to employ cooks is out of what they can save from their rations, and at these recruiting stations it has been found impossible for them to keep cooks with what amount they can save; so the Department asks for this in order that the recruit may have his food properly cooked and served until he is assigned to his command. Another new provision that I did not call attention to yesterday is found on page 23, "for issuance of toilet kits to recruits upon their first enlistment."

The Department requires every recruit to provide himself with what is called a "toilet kit," combs, hairbrushes, tooth-

brushes, and the usual toilet articles that the regulations require every soldier to have. Heretofore they have furnished this to the recruit, and when he went to get his first payment from the paymaster he found that he was in debt about \$4 for what the Government had compelled him to get. This will provide for the Government issuing it to him in the first instance, and then under the regulations require him to keep the kit up from his own earnings. These, I think, are all the new provisions in this paragraph to which attention has not been fully called heretofore.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] withdraw his point of order?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the explanation made by the gentleman from Iowa is quite full, but I would like to ask him about one more matter in reference to it. The existing law provides "for other necessary expenses incident to the purchase, testing, care, preservation, issue, sale, and accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army." I do not find any other provision.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is under the present law.

Mr. MANN. That is the present law. I did not find any other provision for the sale to officers of the Army. Now, in the bill you have a provision for sales to officers and enlisted men of the Army. Can the gentleman say whether that is intended to change the law and to permit new regulations, or whether that is solely in the rearrangement of this paragraph for the purpose of carrying out the existing provisions of law and the existing regulations?

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit me a question?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It is a law both for the officers and men.

Mr. TAWNEY. Has the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] examined the current military appropriation bill to ascertain whether or not that language is not carried in the current law under another paragraph or in another part of the bill?

Mr. MANN. It is carried—

Mr. HAY. It is in the current law.

Mr. TAWNEY. I find it is in the current law, on examination.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Now, here is the law as it stands upon the statute books as to both officers and men:

The officers of the subsistence department shall procure and keep for sale to officers and enlisted men at cost prices, for cash or on credit, such articles as may from time to time be designated by the Inspector-General of the Army. An account of sales on credit shall be kept, and amounts due for the same shall be reported monthly to the Paymaster-General.

Mr. MANN. What is the date of that law?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is 1884.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] that the very same words in this bill are in the current law.

Mr. MANN. I wish the gentleman would show me where they are.

Mr. TAWNEY. They are not at the same place?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No.

Mr. MANN. I can assure the gentleman this authority under subsistence supplies and this authority under quartermaster's supplies do not cover the same ground at all. This provision is in the portion as to quartermaster's supplies and not as to subsistence supplies.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is in.

Mr. HAY. I hold in my hand the original appropriation taken from the current law, and in the first part of the law the words will be found "and for sale to officers and enlisted men of the Army"—sales under the subsistence department.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. What I wanted to emphasize was, even if that had not been in before under the law, it would be in order now. But it is in the present law and has always been carried in appropriation bills.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa whether this change in the location of this language is recommended by the Department in the estimate submitted to Congress?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes; and set out fully in the estimate.

Mr. TAWNEY. Can the gentleman state why the law requiring the Departments to submit their estimates in the form of the current appropriation bill is not observed by the Department so that we may be able to make comparisons? I find a great many changes in this bill, and in the estimate as submitted do not agree at all with the current law. Now, we have a law which requires the Departments to submit their estimates in the form in which the current law has been written.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes; and I want to say to the gentleman that on this very paragraph within the very recent past

the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] found great fault because they mixed their items up, and went from payments to purchases and from purchases to payments, so that you had to look all through everything in order to know what it applied to. In this they have grouped all the purchases in the first part and all the payments in the second part of the paragraph; and the effect of it is that it marvelously simplifies the ability of Members of Congress keeping track of what they are.

Mr. TAWNEY. Provided that the estimates are sent in in that form next year.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. They will be. The committee were all pleased with this change, and when we come to the Quartermaster's Department you will find that there is a rearrangement of a very large number of items, for the reason that we put a proviso in the Army bill last year which segregated what had been in one lump sum of fourteen or fifteen millions. We have divided up in half a dozen different sums, so that we might know what was done with each sum.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer some amendments simply to correct the punctuation, such as to add an "s" and change the punctuation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the clerical corrections suggested by the chairman of the committee? The Chair hears none, and the correction will be made.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 23, line 2, after the word "observation," a semicolon should be inserted; on same page, line 6, after the word "observation," a semicolon should be inserted; and on the same line the word "issue" should read issues; on line 19 the word "chest" should read chests; on page 24, line 17, after the word "orders," a semicolon should be inserted.

The Clerk read as follows:

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

Regular supplies of the Quartermaster's Department, including their care and protection, consisting of stoves and heating apparatus required for heating offices, hospitals, barracks, and quarters, and recruiting stations, and United States military prison; also ranges and stoves, and appliances for cooking and serving food at posts and on transports, and repair and maintenance of such heating and cooking appliances; of fuel and lights for enlisted men, including recruits, guards, hospitals, storehouses, and offices, and for sale to officers, and including also fuel and engine supplies required in the operation of modern batteries at established posts; for post bakeries; for ice machines and their maintenance where required for the health and comfort of the troops and for cold storage; for the construction, operation, and maintenance of laundries at military posts in the United States and its island possessions; for the necessary furniture, text-books, paper, and equipment for the post schools and libraries; for the tableware and mess furniture for kitchens and mess halls, each and all for the enlisted men, including recruits; of forage in kind for the horses, mules, and oxen of the Quartermaster's Department at the several posts and stations and with the armies in the field, and for the horses of the several regiments of cavalry, the batteries of artillery, and such companies of infantry and scouts as may be mounted, and for the authorized number of officers' horses, including bedding for the animals; and nothing in the act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year 1908, or any other act, shall hereafter be held or construed so as to deprive officers of the Army, wherever on duty in the military service of the United States, of forage, bedding, shoeing, or shelter for their authorized number of horses, or of any means of transportation or maintenance therefor for which provision is made by the terms of this act; of straw for soldiers' bedding, and of stationery, including blank books for the Quartermaster's Department, certificates for discharged soldiers, blank forms for the Pay and Quartermaster's departments, and for printing department orders and reports, \$9,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriations for the Quartermaster's Department shall be expended on printing, unless the same shall be done by contract after due notice and competition, except in such cases as the emergency will not admit of the giving notice of competition, and in cases where it is impracticable to have the necessary printing done by contract the same may be done, with the approval of the Secretary of War, by the purchase of material and hire of the necessary labor for the purpose. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, whenever the ice machines, steam laundries, and electric plants shall not come in competition with private enterprise for sale to the public, and in the opinion of the Secretary of War it becomes necessary to the economical use and administration of such ice machines, steam laundries, and electric plants as have been or may hereafter be established in pursuance of law, surplus ice may be disposed of, laundry work may be done for other branches of the Government, and surplus electric light and power may be sold on such terms and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the funds received from such sales and in payment for such laundry work shall be used to defray the cost of operation of said ice, laundry, and electric plants; and the sales and expenditures herein provided for shall be accounted for in accordance with the methods prescribed by law, and any sums remaining, after such cost of maintenance and operation have been defrayed, shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost of operation of such plant is paid.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order on that. I would like to ask the gentleman if this is the same provision as the current law?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. This is the same provision as made in the current law. There is no change at all in this paragraph.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to ask the gentleman from Iowa a

question. I observe that the appropriation in its total in the current law for the fiscal year 1908 is \$6,500,000, and the proposed appropriation for the same purpose is \$9,000,000, or \$2,500,000 in excess of the current law. Will the gentleman explain the necessity of this very great increase?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. One necessity is because of the increased expenditures as shown by the Quartermaster-General of the Army.

Mr. TAWNEY. Increased expenditures in what respect?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The larger number of posts that are to be heated; the larger number of persons that are to be maintained; the larger purchases of feed and the larger amount of expenditures in all lines, and about, I will say, the amount that was appropriated, with the deficiency the gentleman himself said was necessary for this year.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to ask the gentleman another question; whether the appropriations or increase in this item is made upon the theory which was presented to his committee and to all other appropriation committees, at the time the estimates were made, that the prices had increased so much, and whether the committee took into account the fact that on these various items the prices have very greatly decreased, and in all probability will continue to decrease for the next fiscal year?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The gentleman understands that purchases were dealt with by the Quartermaster-General, and he wanted almost a round million more than this. We tried to cut it down as close as we could to the deficiencies and what we had appropriated this year. Our idea was, after the Committee on Appropriations had passed upon it and stated that they must have this additional amount, we could not go much below what had been given this year. We cut off nearly a million of dollars in the estimates for this one item.

Mr. MANN. I want to ask the gentleman a question. I see there is a provision in here at the top of page 27, endeavoring to construe an act of last year. What is the purpose of that, and why?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. There was a provision made here, which, I think, covers all Departments, that the horses were not to be used for anything but Department work. Under the permanent law—now, I may be mistaken in this, but I am giving my impression, and if I am in error members of the committee may correct me, for I am not infallible in these things. Under the permanent law every officer, from a major to a major-general, is entitled to so many horses and entitled to forage for so many horses, graded according to rank. A major, I think, has two.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Captain, major, and colonel.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. A brigadier-general, three; a major-general, four. Now, they do not keep that many, but if they do keep horses here at all, the permanent law that gives them the right to keep horses would be void unless they are exempt from the provision of what is known as the "Landis amendment." If the latest order is to be carried out, it will be absolutely necessary for every officer of the Army in Washington and every other city to keep horses for his private use, or he is liable to be mustered out for not being able to ride.

Mr. MANN. The Landis amendment is not in the current year's appropriation law.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Oh, no.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is permanent law.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman mean that an Army officer must be able to ride on account of the order that was recently issued?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. He goes before a court-martial if he is not able to ride.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman mean to say that a major assigned to staff duty up here gets a horse and forage at the expense of the Government?

Mr. TAWNEY. The law says two horses.

Mr. MANN. I have been trying to find out for a long while what Army officers did get. This is a new lead to me.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Every mounted officer has rations issued to his horse.

Mr. MANN. Does every major?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Every major that keeps a horse.

Mr. MANN. But take the case of a brigadier-general or a major-general here in Washington on staff duty. Does he get a horse and an allowance of forage?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. They buy their own horses, but as a matter of fact very few of them keep horses. Some of them do, but very few. They do not want to keep them, as a matter of fact, because it is an expense to them even with the allowance the Government gives them; but if they are compelled to practice riding so many hours a day, the gentleman can see that they will have to keep horses, no matter where

they are located. If they have got to take a 90-mile ride every year, the gentleman will see the necessity for their practicing up between times.

Mr. MANN. I am told that some of them practice now during every afternoon, which gives them an opportunity to have a pleasure ride while they ought to be working in the Department. That does not apply to all of them, of course.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is something that this bill has nothing to do with. My understanding is that it does not include the captains or the lieutenants, but all field officers are compelled to take these annual rides, and that they are let off duty, I think, so many hours per week for the purpose of practicing in horsemanship; but it is a regulation.

Mr. MANN. Do these officers get compensation for forage, bedding, shoeing, and shelter?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No; they get nothing at all unless they keep a horse. There is no commutation of rations for a horse.

Mr. MANN. Do they keep the horse and then get paid the amount, or how is that done?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No.

Mr. MANN. Does the Government keep the horse?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. If the Government keeps the horse, it keeps him in a Government stable. There are several quartermaster stables here, and they have the amount of forage provided by the Army Regulations, as the feed for a cavalry horse or an artillery horse, issued for the care of that horse, but they get no commutation whatever.

Mr. CAPRON. Just fodder.

Mr. MANN. I have a great deal of sympathy for those fat officers who are required to take a military ride because our strenuous President believes in it.

Mr. MADDEN. The officers are not furnished the horses at the expense of the Government, are they?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. They are not supposed to be.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the fact?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. If they are furnished at the expense of the Government, of course the Government simply feeds its own horses, and the officer has nothing to do with that.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the fact?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I think the Government furnishes a good many horses.

Mr. TAWNEY. We appropriate no money for that.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would say to the gentleman that I would be in favor of reorganizing this thing.

Mr. MADDEN. Reorganizing it up or down?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Cutting off the extra pay for this reason: When we separated the Coast and Heavy Artillery, one branch went into the unmounted service and the other into the mounted service, and I understand every officer of Field Artillery gets \$200 a year more, if he is a captain, on account of being a mounted officer. I think he ought to have something more, because his extra expense is a little more; but I think it is too much as it is to-day. When they go to the Philippines, every mounted captain gets \$200 more than an infantry captain.

Mr. MADDEN. Why?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Because that is fixed by law.

Mr. MADDEN. What was the idea of it?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Because he is supposed to own his own horse and care for one horse outside of rations.

Mr. MADDEN. Does he not detail a member of his company to take care of his horse?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I understand not, but he does employ a member of the company very frequently at much less than \$200 a year.

Mr. MANN. Is he required to employ him?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Another reason why I think it is unfair to an infantry officer is because we give 10 per cent additional pay in the Philippine Islands, and a mounted officer gets 10 per cent additional on the \$200, not only on the flat pay, but on the \$200. And yet no officer mounted in the Philippine Islands does furnish his own horse. The Government furnishes all and saves money by it, because you take your horse over and pay the expense, and then they are not allowed to come back on account of the regulations of the Agricultural Department prohibiting the importation of animals from the Tropics.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, does not the Government furnish all the horses not only in this country, but in other countries?

Mr. MANN. Does not this bill carry an item or items under which various horses are purchased for various officials of the Government?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. No.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman shakes his head, but he ought

to be better informed, because it does—not only to Army officers, but to other officers of the Government, and if it were known how many they did furnish—

Mr. MADDEN. I want to ask the gentleman a further question. Is there any provision in the bill, or any regulation of the Army, requiring the officers to take automobile rides; and if so, who furnishes the automobiles and drivers?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I know of no provision on that subject.

Mr. MADDEN. Are there any automobiles in the service?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I do not know of any; they have used automobiles at the grand maneuvers, but the officers paid for them out of their own pockets.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, before offering a formal amendment on another subject, I want to say a word about the question of horses. It is considered in every army a very important thing that mounted officers in the field should own their own horses. An officer ought to have the best horse, and ought to have a pride in it. It has always been the regulation that they should own their own horses and ride their own horses. For this there was always allowed a difference of \$200 a year. The \$200 a year represents partly the cost of the horse which has to be bought every now and then, every two or three years; and, second, it represents the expense of keeping the horse, for every officer, whether he has a Government horse or his own private horse, must pay \$7 a month, which is the average price for taking care of that horse, or \$84 a year.

And, thirdly, it represents an item that is rather hard to estimate, but the value of which everybody will see is considerable—that is, the wear and tear upon the saddle, saddlecloth, bridle, boots, and clothes. The infantry officer is not required to furnish riding breeches, riding boots, or spurs, or gauntlet gloves, or other equipment used on horseback, which, all together, including the saddle, would come to a cost of \$100 or \$150, and which are used up, when there is constant saddle work, very fast, as anybody knows who has been in the saddle three or four hours a day for nearly a week.

Now, the \$200 is not an exorbitant allowance for all these things. It is rather under than over what the officer has to expend.

The difficulty, however, is that for the officers that are in the Philippines the Government has had to provide horses, and in many cases it has become the custom to allow an officer to use an Army horse. Under these circumstances this allowance ought to be reduced. It should not be taken away, because the wear and tear of the clothes and equipments and the payment of \$7 a month to the man to take care of the horse remains. But it ought to be reduced.

On the other hand, an officer who lives here in Washington or elsewhere, and who gets mounted pay, ought either to own and ride a horse suitable for use in all respects by the Government or else he ought not to have mounted pay.

I will say that this is only one of the questions that will arise if the question of the pay of officers comes into the House. If the increase of pay of officers is taken up in the House, I shall offer a provision which will take care of this subject, and do it fairly to the men in the field and to the men at home.

I make this explanation only because there seems to be some confusion on the subject, and naturally so, as it involves so many items.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. If there be nothing further to be said on this subject, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 10, insert, after the second word "and," the words "for and."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would like to have some explanation. It looks to me that this is mixing things up awfully.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Let me read it as it would be if the amendment were adopted:

Of fuel and lights for enlisted men, including recruits, guards, hospitals, storehouses, and officers, and for and for sale to officers, etc.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for this is this, that up to last year lights in the garrisons and various posts were always paid for by the officers. Last year a proviso was introduced into the bill which said:

Provided, That hereafter heat and light actually necessary for the authorized allowance of quarters for officers and enlisted men shall be furnished at the expense of the United States under such regulations as the Secretary of War may provide.

Mr. MANN. It is the intention of the gentleman to furnish these free to the officers?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. To that extent only, as given by the law last year, and I don't care whether—well, you might put in for enlisted men and officers. Part of it they pay for and part they do not. What is furnished as necessary is not paid for. If they take more, they have to pay for it.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the present appropriation bill carries provisions making permanent law of the issuance to officers for their fuel and lights, but it also, under the regulations, limits it to each rank for so much. An officer going beyond that has to buy what he gets. Under the present law, with the language we have here, they have carried out that provision by issuing them free up to a certain amount, according to each rank, and selling them any surplus heat or light they may want to use.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there any difficulty under this language?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I have never heard of any. I have no objection if the gentleman thinks that this makes it clearer.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Last year there was an express provision that it should be supplied to officers free.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is permanent law.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. This year it ought to provide for the expense of furnishing lights to officers.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. On the statute books the same provision that is now carried in this bill last year is now permanent law, and permanent law must be construed, I should imagine, with this, although if the gentleman thinks his language makes it clearer I have no objection.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this language is the language submitted by the Department, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey is avowedly for the purpose of giving something more to these officers in the way of fuel, etc. The committee has gone over this very carefully, and I think we better stand by the committee. We don't know what the effect of this amendment will be. I don't.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I do not know exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making an inquiry. Since passing page 20, line 21, I have received from the Department a decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury which I think changes the meaning that the committee intended to give to the law. Line 21 on page 20 is as follows:

For subsistence, mileage, and commutation of quarters to officers of the National Guard attending service and garrison schools, \$10,000.

Now, as I understand, it was the intention of the committee and of the House when that paragraph was incorporated in the bill of 1903, and it has been so construed up until recently, that this gave to the officers of the National Guard the same pay and allowance that was given to officers in the Regular Army of similar rank, and it was the understanding that the term "and commutation of quarters" included allowance and commutation for heat and light. That was the ruling of the Judge-Advocate-General. Under this interpretation, holding that it did include allowance for heat and light, the officers in those schools received the pay. Now, within the past few weeks the Comptroller of the Treasury has rendered an opinion in which he holds the words "commutation of quarters" do not include allowance for heat and light, and he has accordingly called on the officers who have been attending these garrison schools and who have received this allowance to pay it back. Of course we can not relieve them from this, but I want to ask the gentleman if he would not be willing now to revert to this section for the purpose of amending it so as to make it read, "for subsistence, mileage, and commutation of quarters"—

Mr. MANN. Tell us where that is.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Page 20, line 21—so as to make it read, "for subsistence, mileage, and commutation of quarters, to include allowance for heat and light."

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will ask the gentleman to wait until we get through with the bill. I think if we insert right after the word "quarters" "including fuel and light," that would cover it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I am perfectly willing to wait, if that can be done. The reason I ask it now is I thought if we could not return and put it in its proper place, it would not be subject to the point of order if offered now as an amendment.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It would be subject now, but we can go back when we conclude the bill. I think the gentleman is right, that it ought to include fuel and light. If you are going to send them to these schools at all, you ought to provide for them as other officers of the Army.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman from Iowa would not object to returning to that section at the conclusion of the reading of the bill?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would like to look into the question a little more and see this decision of the Comptroller.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I have the decision here.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It does not increase the amount?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It does not carry any additional appropriation whatever. The same appropriation will cover it that has covered it.

Mr. MANN. It would cost more money.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No; it does not.

Mr. MANN. If nobody gets any money now under the language, it would.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It would not carry a larger appropriation, I will say, but it will, of course, cost more money. The officers of the National Guard who are attending these schools are now obliged to pay for what was heretofore paid by the Government and what we intended the Government should pay. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe there is no branch of the service that is more entitled to a liberal appropriation than the Medical Corps of the Army.

It has been our experience and it has been the experience of all people in all wars that more men die of disease than die on the battlefield, and one of the things we learned from the recent war between Japan and Russia, and the thing that is best worth remembering, is that three out of four who made up the death list of the Japanese army died of wounds received on the battlefield, whereas in the civil war three out of four men whom we lost died of disease in the hospitals. It is impossible for any man, any physician, any medical officer in the Army to take charge of raw recruits and conduct the medical arm of the service in an efficient manner unless he has had the proper training and the proper experience, and believing this, we have provided these schools where these National Guard officers may attend and get this training.

But as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said a few days ago—and I think I could get unanimous consent to the proposition that he is more accurately informed on all details of legislation here than any other man in the House—he did not believe any man on earth knew what the pay of an Army officer was, and that statement was agreed to by my friend from Virginia [Mr. HAY], one of the ranking Democrats on the committee. When Congress passed this law we believed we were making provision for all these allowances and commutations, and so forth, but the Comptroller of the Treasury has by construction decided that we did not, and my proposition is simply to put into the law now what we thought was there all the time and what we intended to put there when that law was enacted.

As there seems to be some doubt of my securing unanimous consent to return to the paragraph, I think I will say now what I have to say on this subject and in amplification of what I suggested yesterday on the Foster amendment.

We ought to do all in our power to encourage the medical officers in the National Guard to attend these schools. We have proceeded, ever since the formation of this Government, upon the idea that "a well-regulated militia is necessary to the security of a free state."

So insistent indeed were our fathers upon that proposition that the very first Congress which assembled under the Constitution proposed that it be written into the organic law of the land, and so it was. There can be no well-regulated militia which is not provided with an efficient medical corps. This is the sine qua non.

The experience of all people in all the wars of history has put this beyond the pale of controversy.

Mr. CANDLER. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. CANDLER. I agree fully with all my friend has said, and we all recall the sad experiences of the Spanish war, when our boys died like sheep in the hospitals. Now, does not the gentleman think that it would be greatly to the advantage of the whole service if the National Guard were permitted to go into encampment with the regulars and thereby enable their surgeons to reap the benefit of experience in camp with Regular Army surgeons?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Most assuredly, Mr. Chairman; and I will say further that I believe that that alone would have been worth the appropriation asked for by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] in the amendment which he offered yesterday and which was voted down. My colleague and myself can both lay the flattering unction to our souls, however, that we voted for the proposition, and that it failed through no fault of ours.

Mr. CANDLER. And does not the gentleman also think that the service might also be improved by giving the Regular Army surgeon an opportunity to associate with and observe the methods of administration of the medical corps of the Mississippi National Guard?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I most heartily concur in that statement, too, Mr. Chairman. I stated in the course of the debate yesterday that the State of Mississippi took a special pride in the efficiency of her medical corps, and I meant all I said. It is a source of much satisfaction and pride not only to the members of our guard, but to the whole State, and since the subject has been broached I will state that Major Dowdy, of the Regular Army, who was sent to attend the annual encampment of the Mississippi National Guard in 1905, reported to the governor of Mississippi that the hospital service at that encampment was more nearly perfect than any he had ever seen in the National Guard or in the Regular Army.

Reference to our experience in the Spanish war was made just now. Of course conditions were not normal in that war, because so few of our troops were ever actually engaged in battle; but the sad fact remains that in that war we lost fourteen men by disease to every one who was killed by a bullet. We were willing to spend the money, to hire the surgeons, and to buy the equipment, but we had been practicing this foolish economy before that war, and of course it found us lamentably unprepared, and nowhere was this unpreparedness more glaring and nowhere so frightful in its consequences as in the Medical Corps of the Army. Surgeons were employed and put in the hospitals who were thoroughly competent to manage a ward at Bellevue, but it was quite a different matter to administer a field hospital at Miami or Chickamauga. In a very interesting article read by Lieut. Col. Homer I. Jones, A. S. G., Indiana National Guard, before the Association of Military Surgeons at the Jamestown Exposition, he said, among other things:

Speaking of the medical corps of the volunteer troops in the Spanish war:

It is but just to all to admit that the medical officers generally were men of medical and surgical ability—capable of doing whatever might have been demanded of them in the care of the sick and injured; but I believe, with few exceptions, they were lacking in all knowledge of military subjects and incapable of performing the military part of their duties.

Trained diagnosticians, trained clinicians, and thorough physicians they were, but trained military surgeons in all which that term implies, too often they were not.

And again:

If it should be the lot of this country to be engaged at some future time in war, it is my opinion that her greatest need would be thoroughly trained medical officers—thoroughly trained, not only in medicine and surgery, but also in sanitation and hygiene, in military correspondence, reports, hospital corps work, and all other things which may come to them in the discharge of their duty.

To teach officers their duties after they are given their commissions necessarily prolongs the task of making an army, and, if possible, such delay should be avoided. It can be avoided to some extent if the medical officers of the State forces are efficient.

Every day during those sad months in the hospitals we watched the struggle between—

Weariness with the bated breath;
Skeleton boy against skeleton death.

Never a day that we did not hear bitter imprecations called down upon the head of our Medical Corps, and yet it was not their fault. It was the fault of the Congresses which had preceded that war and which had failed to make proper provision for the training of the Medical Corps; and if grim-visaged war shall come again, as come it surely will, the sin of unpreparedness will rest upon our heads if we fail now to provide for the necessary training of our surgeons.

I am opposed to a large army. It is unnecessary and unwise to maintain a large military establishment in times of peace. When war comes a volunteer army can readily be put into the field, but it will be too late then to train surgeons. While they are learning the details of administration, or army hygiene, of camp police; while they are delving into the manuals and endeavoring to equip a field hospital, the brave boys who answered the call to arms will be dying with preventable diseases in the insanitary hospitals, all for the lack of proper medical assistance. We can call out and equip an army of 200,000 men on very short notice.

We can do more. We can equip an army of 500,000 men, brave, patriotic, and intelligent, but when their hands are tied by the muster-in oath they are as helpless to care for themselves as babies.

In a memorandum which he prepared for the President in 1904 the Surgeon-General of the Army, among other things, said:

In the Spanish war the country was scandalized by a monthly death rate from disease, which rose from 2.15 per thousand in July to 4.08 in August, but fell again to 2.15 in September.

He stated further that 600 wounded soldiers were permitted to lie on the battlefield for more than ten days after the battle of second Bull Run in August, 1862, and that many of them died of starvation. Proceeding, he said:

That this was not one of the unavoidable horrors of war, but was, as stated by the Surgeon-General, due to defective medical organization is evidenced by the fact that after the organization of the am-

balance service of Letterman such occurrences ceased in the Army of the Potomac. After the battle of Fredericksburg, December 13, 1862, and Chancellorsville, May 2, 1863, although the Army was defeated the field was cleared of wounded without confusion.

It has been more than fifty years since Florence Nightingale, a ministering angel, went to relieve the suffering soldiers in the hospitals of the Crimea. Men were dying in one camp for the want of medicine, which was piled in heaps in another camp not 20 miles away. The medicine was bought and shipped to the army in ample abundance, just as we would be willing to pour out money to relieve the suffering when war is upon us. But there was that lack of administrative ability which can come only from experience and training, and that nobody had. Change the names of men and places, and this extract from McCarthy's History of Our Own Times, giving an account of the conditions in the Crimea, would pass anywhere as a daily news item in our papers during the summer of 1898:

The hospitals for the sick and wounded at Scutari were in a wretchedly disorganized condition. They were for the most part in an absolutely chaotic condition as regards arrangement and supply.

In some instances medical stores were left to decay at Varna or were found lying useless in the holds of vessels in Balaklava Bay, which were needed for the wounded at Scutari. The medical officers were able and zealous men; the stores were provided and paid for so far as our government was concerned; but the stores were not brought to the medical men. These had their hands all but idle, their eyes and souls tortured by the sight of sufferings which they were unable to relieve for want of the commonest appliances of the hospital. "One man's preserved meat," exclaimed Punch with bitter humor, "is another man's poison."

Fifty years later the British soldier was sent to war again, into the Transvaal country. Let me give a few figures which I quote from official records. In the two years of that war 63,644 soldiers were invalidated home on account of disease, and 8,221 on account of wounds. Deaths from disease in that same army were seven times more than deaths from wounds.

Longmore's tables based on records for the past two hundred years, and which are accepted as the most accurate and reliable, show that there has rarely been a war of any great duration in which four men have not died from disease to every one who died from a bullet.

In the Russo-Turkish war 80,000 men died from disease and 20,000 from wounds. In the Crimean war the allied forces lost 50,000 men from disease and 2,000 from bullets. In the war with China in 1894 the sick in the Japanese army were eight times more numerous than the wounded. In the recent war with Russia the sick and the wounded in the Japanese army were exactly equal in numbers.

In the Chinese war the Japanese lost three men from disease to every one who was killed in battle or died from wounds received in battle. When the Chinese war ended Russia stepped in and robbed Japan of the fruits of her dearly bought victory. Russia was great and powerful and Japan was forced to yield. She went home, however, and determined to prepare for a death struggle which she realized must come with Russia. We all know the result. The world has rung with the praises of the generals who commanded her victorious armies and the admirals who swept the Russian fleet from the face of the ocean; but, Mr. Chairman, was the victory theirs? Let us look again at the figures.

I have done a little arithmetic which I believe will be interesting. On the 1st of May, 1905, the Japanese had lost in killed during the war to that date 43,892 men. Suppose her death rate from disease had borne the same ratio to her killed as England's had in the Boer war—that is, 7 to 1. Her deaths then would have reached the appalling figure of 307,044. To whom, then, shall we give the glory of the victory at Metre Hill and Mukden? To the general who commanded or to the surgeon who had preserved from death the men who composed this mighty army of 253,152 fighting men who, but for the skill, but for the masterful administration of a matchless hospital system, would then have been sleeping upon that silent field—

Where glory guards with solemn round
The bivouac of the dead.

We are training our militia so that we may not be unprepared when the tocsin of war shall be sounded. We will then send them out to do battle against two foes. One they will meet upon the red field of battle amid the pomp and glorious circumstance of war. Of every thousand whose lives must be sacrificed then, this proud foe will claim 200, while the other 800 will fall before that silent reaper who will stalk through the camp at nighttime unseen by the sentinel and unmarked by the victim, the grim, gaunt specter of disease.

Who then is the hero? The general who leads his battalions against the panoplied army with banners and loses 200 men or the surgeon who out of the lime light of the world's vain glory makes ceaseless and successful warfare against that real enemy whose sickle is claiming the other 800? His name is not blazoned in the headlines of the daily papers; no holidays

are made to his honor; no triumph is awarded him upon his home-coming; but somewhere to-day in the Flowery Kingdom, unless he has already passed from the scenes of this turbulent earth, there is the hero who reorganized and administered the medical corps of the Japanese army and who, by reversing the figures of all previous wars and returning a loss of only one by disease to four by bullets, has won and deserves, though he will never receive, the crowning glory of that war. All honor to the army surgeon. None of the stern joy is his. None of the glamour; none of the pomp and glorious circumstance. The bugle's blare and the cannon's roar may fire the soul upon the battle's crest, but far to the rear, where the dying are, with no sound but the groans of the wounded, he sees the bleeding business that is done and sets about to smooth war's wrinkled front.

We ought to have more colonels; yes, we ought to create more generals in the Medical Corps, and endeavor thereby to attract men of genius into the service. We have officers now sufficient for an army of 100,000 men, but we have surgeons sufficient only for an army of 42,000. I tremble when I think of the price our soldiers will pay for our folly when war again shall come upon us.

I see my time has expired, Mr. Chairman, and I will ask therefore that I may revise my remarks before they appear in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Incidental expenses: Postage; cost of telegrams on official business received and sent by officers of the Army; extra pay to soldiers employed on extra duty, under the direction of the Quartermaster's Department, in the erection of barracks, quarters, and storehouses, in the construction of roads and other constant labor for periods of not less than ten days, and as clerks for post quartermasters at military posts, and for prison overseers at posts designated by the War Department for the confinement of general prisoners, and for noncommissioned officers of the United States military prison guard: *Provided*, That hereafter no part of the moneys appropriated for use of the Quartermaster's Department shall be used in payment of extra-duty pay for the Army service men in the Quartermaster's Department at West Point; for expenses of express to and from frontier posts and armies in the field, of escorts to paymasters and other disbursing officers, and to trains where military escorts can not be furnished; expenses of the internment of officers killed in action or who die when on duty in the field, or at military posts or on the frontiers, or when traveling under orders, and of noncommissioned officers and soldiers; and in all cases where such expenses would have been lawful claims against the Government, reimbursement may be made of expenses heretofore or hereafter incurred by individuals of burial and transportation of remains of officers, including acting assistant surgeons, not to exceed the amount now allowed in the cases of officers, and for the reimbursement in the cases of enlisted men not exceeding the amount now allowed in their cases, may be paid out of the proper funds appropriated by this act, and the disbursing officers shall be credited with such reimbursement heretofore made; but hereafter no reimbursement shall be made of such expenses incurred prior to the 21st day of April, 1898; authorized office furniture, hire of laborers in the Quartermaster's Department, including the hire of interpreters, spies, or guides for the Army; compensation of clerks and other employees to the officers of the Quartermaster's Department, and clerks, foremen, watchmen, and organist for the United States military prison, and incidental expenses of recruiting; for the apprehension, securing, and delivering of deserters, including escaped military prisoners, and the expenses incident to their pursuit, and no greater sum than \$50 for each deserter or escaped military prisoner shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be paid to any civil officer or citizen for such services and expenses; for a donation of \$5 to each dishonorably discharged prisoner upon his release from confinement, under court-martial sentence, involving dishonorable discharge; for the following expenditures required for the several regiments of cavalry, the batteries of light artillery, and such companies of infantry and scouts as may be mounted, the authorized number of officers' horses, and for the trains, to wit: Hire of veterinary surgeons, purchase of medicines for horses and mules, picket ropes, blacksmith's tools and materials, horseshoes and blacksmith's tools for the cavalry service, and for the shoeing of horses and mules, and such additional expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the movements and operations of the Army, and of military posts, and not expressly assigned to any other department, \$2,200,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to the fact that the language on page 29, under the proviso, "that hereafter no part of the moneys appropriated for the use of the Quartermaster's Department shall be used in payment of extra-duty pay for the Army service men in the quartermaster's department at West Point," is now permanent law. It is carried in the appropriation bill of last year and it makes it very difficult for Members of Congress and people keeping track of legislation to do so, and by keeping these permanent provisions of the law in the appropriation bill, besides padding it out, it makes it much more difficult for the committee, and I suggest to your committee that it might as well be stricken out.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I can see no objection whatever to striking it out. It was put in last year because we provided extra-duty men for West Point and relieved the Quartermaster's Department of that expense.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 8, 9, and 10, and line 11, up to and including the word "Point."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, beginning with line 8, strike out lines 8, 9, and 10, and line 11, including the semicolon, after the words "West Point."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Horses for cavalry, artillery, and engineers: For the purchase of horses for the cavalry, artillery, and engineers, service school and staff colleges, and for the Indian scouts, and for such infantry and members of the Hospital Corps in field campaigns as may be required to be mounted, and the expenses incident thereto, \$514,678: *Provided*, That the number of horses purchased under this appropriation, added to the number now on hand, shall be limited to the actual needs of the mounted service, including reasonable provisions for remounts, and, unless otherwise ordered by the Secretary of War, no part of this appropriation shall be paid out for horses not purchased by contract after competition duly invited by the Quartermaster's Department and an inspection under the direction and authority of the Secretary of War. When practicable, horses shall be purchased in the open market at all military posts or stations, when needed, at a maximum price to be fixed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for breeding purposes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman what is the necessity for this new language, "including reasonable provisions for remounts?"

Mr. HULL of Iowa. There is a very strong statement which was given to the committee, that the life of a horse that is purchased now is only three or four years, while if they had the privilege of purchasing younger horses and properly breaking them and keeping them in the camps of the Army until the time they were fit for use in the cavalry, the life of a horse would be as much as ten years, as I remember now. It was also believed that they wanted a little authority for starting some breeding stations, and the committee believes that the Government of the United States should not go into that business. In the hearings it was said by the Quartermaster-General frankly that they should purchase some studs and distribute them around near the different posts, and select certain mares that were properly formed for breeding the kind of horses the Army wanted, and furnish them free, with the option of the Government to buy the colts when they reach the age of 2 years.

But the committee was, I think, unanimously opposed to going into that business, and so the last provision was put in the paragraph. We give them the authority to buy the younger horses and have them properly handled and broken and kept for a year or two. It will make a less cost for the horse at the beginning and a greater cost to the Army, in my judgment, when the horse is brought into active service, but if you extend the life of a horse several years you have made a great saving to the Government.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to say to the gentleman that the purpose as expressed by the gentleman, if it was embodied in appropriate language, would be entirely satisfactory to me and to everybody else, but the language is so general that they can purchase any kind of horses and any number of horses and at any time, provided they are called remounts.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Only for remounts.

Mr. TAWNEY. Including reasonable provision for remounts.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes; they could not go beyond the actual necessities or the present wants of the Army unless you put this language in, because the law now limits them absolutely to the number of animals provided for by law for the different branches of the Army. This would allow that. The hearings are very full on the subject.

Mr. TAWNEY. This is changing the existing law to that extent?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. A remount, to be properly construed, seems to me would mean a horse capable of doing the work for which it is purchased.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It is making a reasonable provision for the remounts. The hearings make it so clear as to what is wanted to be done that I can not imagine an abuse of it. It is simply a question of whether it is good policy to go into that or not.

Mr. MADDEN. The proposition of the chairman of the committee, however, is to give authority to the War Department to buy a lot of young horses that are not capable of being used, and would not be capable of being used for several years after they are purchased.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Six months to a year.

Mr. MADDEN. How old are they when they are capable of being used?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. A horse ought to be 4 years old before being used.

Mr. MADDEN. Do you expect to buy them when they are 2 years old?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And then it would take all the time from two years to four years.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I would suggest to the chairman of the committee that he can find General Ainsworth's statement on pages 142 and 143 and along there.

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] to read the reason for carrying out this provision. My only thought was that the language is so general that you could do almost anything—purchase any kind of a horse under this provision.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I should imagine the Department would be bound by the reasons they give in construing this language, and I can not, with the large number of animals that we have got to have within the next year, see how it is possible to abuse it. The committee was opposed to the part as to breeding.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to make this suggestion to the gentleman, which has been suggested to me by a member of the committee, if it would not meet his approval to insert the word "necessary" after the word "for" and before the word "re-mount," so as to read "reasonable provision for necessary re-mount?"

Mr. HULL of Iowa. "Reasonable provision for remount" I think is just as good as far as the language is concerned as that suggested by the gentleman. As to the number which would be necessary, the War Department would be the judge of what would be necessary.

Mr. TAWNEY. Well, let it go. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military post exchange: For continuing the construction, equipment, and maintenance of suitable buildings at military posts and stations for the conduct of the post exchange school, library, reading, lunch, amusement rooms, and gymnasium, to be expended in the discretion and under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$400,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$40,000 of the above appropriation shall be expended at any one post or station.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I wish to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7 on page 33, after the words "lunch and amusement rooms," insert the following: "wherein the sale of light wines and beer may be permitted."

The paragraph, after being amended, to read:

"Military post exchange: For continuing the construction, equipment, and maintenance of suitable buildings at military posts and stations for the conduct of the post exchange, school, library, gymnasium, reading, lunch, and amusement rooms, wherein the sale of light wines and beer may be permitted, \$400,000, to be expended in the discretion and under the direction of the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That not more than \$40,000 of the above appropriation shall be expended at any one post or station."

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I raise the point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman raise the point of order or reserve it?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. We had debate on that a few days ago. The gentleman made a very excellent speech; and I am anxious to finish this bill to-day if possible. I will just make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no doubt that it is subject to the point of order; and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation of the Army and its supplies: For transportation of the Army and its supplies, including transportation of the troops when moving either by land or water, and of their baggage; of recruits and recruiting parties; of applicants for enlistment between recruiting stations and recruiting depots; of persons on their discharge from the United States military prison to their homes (or elsewhere as they may elect), provided the cost in each case shall not be greater than to the place of last enlistment; of supplies furnished to the militia for the permanent equipment thereof; of the necessary agents and other employees; of clothing and equipage and other quartermaster's stores from Army depots or places of purchase or delivery to the several posts and Army depots, and from those depots to the troops in the field; of horse equipments and of subsistence stores from places of purchase, and from the places of delivery under contract to such places as the circumstances of the service may require them to be sent; of ordnance and ordnance stores, and small arms from the foundries and armories to the arsenals, fortifications, frontier posts, and Army depots; for payment of wharfage, tolls, and ferrage; for transportation of funds of the Army; for the payment as provided by law of Army transportation due such land-grant railroads as have not received aid in Government bonds, \$3,697,561.65.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There are about \$9,000,000 paid out of the public Treasury for transportation for the various branches of the Government, but the bulk of it, I understand, is for the Army. I was informed a year or two ago by one who was investigating the subject somewhat that the method of the administration of that branch of the service was, in his judgment, unbusinesslike and exceedingly wasteful. He said that requests for transportation of officers and troops and bills of lading for transportation of supplies for long distances were made in install-

ments or fragments. For instance, if a carload of supplies for the Army were shipped from New York to California, there were always two bills of lading, involving unnecessary accounting. The accounting officers were required to do the classification; and he said that it was a burdensome and unnecessarily expensive system; that mistakes were often made; and he claimed that it cost the Government a great many thousand dollars a year. It would seem that if his statements were true—and I made the motion to get information—the method or system ought to be corrected.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Do I understand you to say that the gentleman who gave you this information stated that on freight shipments made from New York to San Francisco two bills of lading were made?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Almost universally.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And they were shipped to some intermediate point and reshipped?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They were shipped to an intermediate point and reshipped, and always from New York to Ogden and from Ogden to San Francisco.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Thereby implying that they did not get the benefit of a through rate, but took two local rates, perhaps?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That might be. His complaint was it involved accountings of different sets of accounting officers. He said that there were fourteen officers scattered all over the United States disbursing these accounts of the Quartermaster's office of the War Department.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Did he say whether or not these shipments were over bond-aided and land-grant roads?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Some were, and some were not; and he said it did not make any difference. The Comptroller of the Treasury had called the attention of the War Department to the unbusinesslike character of the system and had suggested improvement. It is just as easy to apportion the cost of freight and division of receipts between ordinary roads and land-grant and bond-aided roads. Every bill of lading is from New York to Ogden, and they have the accounts upon that bill adjusted and the payments made at Omaha, and they have them audited and examined and payments made by the disbursing officer at San Francisco for the other end of the route. These reports have all to go to the War Department. It involves a double investigation, and the classification has to be made, it seems, by a disbursing officer or by some officer in the War Department. Where the goods are miscellaneous, they do not agree on the classifications; mistakes often occur, and a great deal of money is lost in that way. It is true in relation to transportation of officers and troops likewise. Requests are made for a through trip, and the transportation is given for a certain portion of the route and then another for the remainder of the route, and in some instances the trip is broken up into three different fragments.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Did he suggest why, in his opinion, that was done in that way?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It was an old custom that had originated years ago, and it had never occurred to anyone to improve it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And that it was adhered to because it was an old custom?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It never had occurred to anybody that the system might be improved. Now, I had this question in mind, and I should like to know from the chairman of this committee if he knows anything about the method of transportation of officers and troops and supplies for the Army?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman that in place of being expensive to do what he suggests, it has been a great saving. The Government gets the benefit of a large reduction on all land-grant roads, such a reduction that even if it were a little farther around it would be economy to ship over a land-grant road. As a matter of fact, in less than eight months more I think this question will be entirely eliminated so far as the freight charges apply on the debt. The Union Pacific is already out, and the Southern Pacific will pay its entire debt in the very near future, and then there will be nothing to do except pay these roads whatever we owe them for freight instead of taking it out of their indebtedness to the Government, so that inducement to use those lines will be removed.

[The time of Mr. CRUMPACKER having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended five minutes.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will say in addition that the language of the bill formerly was much fuller than it is now with reference to shipping over these land-grant roads. I have no

information beyond what the gentleman has, but I can not believe that the Department, for the last forty or forty-five years, has been shipping material in the most expensive way it could. The question has never been brought to the attention of the committee in any way, except that as the roads were eliminated from the restrictions heretofore the restrictions have been dropped out.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I send to the Clerk's desk a statement prepared by a gentleman who was connected with the Department. I think his business was to investigate this question, and I ask to have it read in my own time. It explains the method under which they do business pretty fully, and it is at least quasi-official.

The CHAIRMAN. The communication will be read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

SIR: I have the honor to present to your notice a few facts concerning a system in issuing for a single movement two separate bills of lading and requests for freight and passenger transportation in certain sections of the United States. This system causes a great deal of extra work and confusion, and in a number of cases overpayments in the settling and auditing of transportation accounts, which should be corrected. There is a habit throughout the Quartermaster's Department, United States Army, of issuing two, and sometimes more, requests and bills of lading for transportation of the Army and its supplies. There is a regulation which provides that separate bills of lading and requests shall be issued where bond-aided service is involved. As a rule, this occurs on what is known as transcontinental business—that is, the service that passes through either El Paso, Tex., Mojave, Cal., or Ogden, Utah. I can find no good reason from the Government standpoint for this system. I do find that it causes a great deal of confusion, uncertainty, overpayments to railroads, and a duplication of work in this office.

For an example, I will illustrate one shipment of freight, from New York to San Francisco, Cal. The quartermaster in New York ships a carload of miscellaneous supplies to San Francisco. He issues two bills of lading, one for the service east of Ogden and one west. That portion east of Ogden is paid by some quartermaster, say, at Omaha, Neb. His account passes through the Quartermaster-General's Office, Washington, D. C., and is acted upon by that office, then it is sent to the Auditor for the War Department for audit. The quartermaster's division of this office passes upon it. Thus three sets of clerks have handled the eastern portion of the shipment. Each clerk must figure out the lowest net cash rate, classify each article, and subdivide the earnings on Ogden, Utah, in order to pay that portion which is due east of Ogden.

The second bill of lading is handled by the quartermaster's office at San Francisco and finally sent to the Quartermaster-General to be transmitted to this office to be settled by the civil-claims division. The clerks in this division must go through the same procedure and cover the same identical ground that was covered in the settlement for the east of Ogden portion. This is clearly a duplication of work in this office, also in the Quartermaster-General's Office.

This system of dividing a shipment is harmful to the Government. It increases the work in the Treasury and War Departments twofold. Errors are more liable to occur, such as the wrong division of earnings, which cause overpayments to the railroads. The system now in force, of issuing two sets of bills of lading and requests to railroads for transportation, compels the Government to make two distinct settlements and relieves the railroads of the necessity of hiring clerks to make the settlement with their connections. In other words, the Government is using its clerks to do the work that should be done by the railroad companies themselves. If this system of dividing settlements can be stopped and through bills of lading and requests issued for the transportation from starting point to destination, the work now done on this business will be reduced one-half and settlements will be expedited in this office, errors less apt to occur, and the clerk will have more confidence in each settlement, as he will have the whole transaction before him, and will know for a certainty that the through rate is not exceeded and is the lowest that can be made, and not overpay the claimant, and a uniformity of classification will exist.

The way to correct this system is simple. A clause should be added to the appropriations that are available for transportation as follows: "That hereafter no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay for transportation performed upon fragmentary requests or bills of lading."

In other words, a single bill of lading for freight, and request for passenger transportation, shall be issued for the entire distance, from starting point to destination.

Respectfully,

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the committee. I understood him to say that the Government has no reduced rates over these railroads after their bonded indebtedness to the Government is paid.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Oh, yes; it has. But while they are owing the Government the amount of the whole shipment is taken out and applied on the debt. When the debt is canceled they then have a preferential rate by putting it in this law; but not, if we do not. The court has held in the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe case, where that road brought suit (the decision will be found on page 215 of the hearings), that the company is entitled to recover. That was before this provision was carried in the Army bill; but in 1891 it was put in, providing for the transportation of the Army and its supplies. I will read the provision:

That aided railroads having claims against the United States for transportation of troops and supplies shall only be paid out of the moneys appropriated by the foregoing provisions (that is, the amount

appropriated for transportation) on the basis of such rate for the transportation of such troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property as the Secretary of War shall deem just and reasonable, such rate not to exceed 60 per cent of the compensation for such Government transportation as shall at the time be charged to and paid by private parties.

Since that it has been cut down to not to exceed 50 per cent, and it has been carried in here from year to year, and it is important to keep it in here if we are going to get that reduction.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. So that the bond-aided and land-grant-aided railroads do give to the War Department these preferential rates of about 50 per cent.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Aside from any payments on obligations that are still remaining. Now, I should like to ask the gentleman whether the railroads competing with these land-grant-aided railroads also give the Government the same rate?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I can not answer that from my own personal knowledge. The gentleman from California says he understands that, in order to get a part of the business, they do.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase and repair of ships, boats, and other vessels required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for garrison purposes; for expenses of sailing public transports on the various rivers, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific oceans; and for the purchase and repair of harbor boats, and repair of boats for the seacoast artillery service, \$5,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph. This seems to be a very large sum of money appropriated here. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how far it is the current law providing the same items for the purchase indiscriminately of harbor boats for transportation, etc.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I can only answer that the estimates given us were for a very much larger sum and included boats for the Seacoast Artillery. We struck out all the provision for the seacoast with the exception of repairs. The repairs for the Seacoast Artillery are made by the Quartermaster's Department, and to have stricken that out would have prevented the Quartermaster's Department from making repairs.

My understanding is that these items were all covered in other language employed heretofore, not specifically, and that was one of the reasons we put in a proviso last year requiring specific appropriations on these different items. Last year we could not tell what was done; it was an innumerable list of things aggregating \$15,000,000. With the consent of the House the committee put a provision on requiring them to make more detailed estimates. The Quartermaster-General says that these appropriations were all carried under one head of transportation of the Army and supplies.

Mr. MANN. It may be that the Department had the authority. The bill is all rearranged this year and it is difficult to make a comparison between this bill and the bill of last year. Here is an appropriation of \$5,000,000 which might be used, as far as the terms of the bill are concerned, for the purchase of vessels. No one objects to the repair of Army transports, but how many Army transports do they propose to purchase out of this provision?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I do not understand that they propose to purchase any; they propose to repair them and propose to buy four harbor boats for the Quartermaster's Department.

Mr. MANN. At what expense?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Two hundred and twenty-eight thousand dollars for the four.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has had charge of looking that up and he can probably give the gentleman more detailed information than I can.

Mr. KAHN. The Department asked for \$5,224,437 under this item and included in it three boats for the seacoast defense. Those were to be used principally for towing targets for target practice. We struck that from the bill.

Mr. MANN. That was a matter that the Committee on Military Affairs had no jurisdiction of.

Mr. KAHN. So we understood.

Mr. MANN. But you included it in the general language so that it can be used for the same purpose.

Mr. KAHN. We think not.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No; oh, no.

Mr. KAHN. We struck out the language submitted by the Department which covered these boats; we struck that from the bill.

Mr. MANN. What was the estimate?

Mr. KAHN. Five million two hundred and twenty-four thousand and some odd dollars.

Mr. MANN. You struck out these boats and put in \$5,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. We struck out the boats which cost \$147,000 and struck out the language covering the boats.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. We left in simply the language covering the repairs, but for the purchase of boats for the seacoast artillery we struck that out.

Mr. MANN. What are the harbor boats that cost so much?

Mr. KAHN. The harbor boats are not so very expensive. There are some that cost \$12,000 apiece.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say that four of them would cost \$228,000.

Mr. KAHN. That is a different kind of a boat. It is used by the artillery service in carrying men to different forts for practice and instruction. They are quartermasters' boats, but they have nothing to do with the seacoast defense. They are absolutely necessary for the purpose of giving the artillerymen proper instruction.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it the purpose, as the gentleman understands it, for the Coast Artillery to use these boats in connection with their target practice for the purpose of towing their targets to sea?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; the boats for the seacoast artillery service were said to be for that purpose, and we struck that item from the provisions of the bill and left it for the Fortifications Committee.

Mr. TAWNEY. Then what is the necessity of including the language here, "and repair of boats for the seacoast artillery service?"

Mr. KAHN. That is repairing.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is repairing.

Mr. KAHN. That is not the construction of new ones.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. If a boiler bursts the Quartermaster's Department does the repairing, and it was thought that if you had to go to the seacoast artillery entirely for repairs it would be at least a very inconvenient method of administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction and maintenance of military and post roads, bridges, and trails in the district of Alaska, to be expended under the direction of the board of road commissioners described in section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction and maintenance of roads, the establishment and maintenance of schools, and the care and support of insane persons in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved January 27, 1905, and to be expended conformably to the provisions of said act, \$250,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the language on line 18, "to remain available until expended."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After "dollars," in line 18, insert:

"To remain available until the close of the fiscal year 1910."

Mr. MADDEN. I reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will say if this work was done by contract there would be no use of this, but it is done by day work largely, and it is impossible to complete the work under one fiscal year without lapping over somewhat, on account of the shortness of the season and the great distance from the source of supplies.

Mr. MADDEN. It is all for Alaska?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to ask if the committee has considered the necessity of making this appropriation immediately available, the same as the appropriation for the Geological Survey is made immediately available in order that the officers of the Government may begin work at the time that they can, about the first or the middle of May, or two months before the end of the fiscal year, being two months before this appropriation will become available? Have they money enough to go on with the work as soon as it is possible for them to go to work and continue the balance of this fiscal year?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I have the impression that they have enough to go on, because I think it was available until expended before.

Mr. TAWNEY. The reason I ask is because the appropriation made for the Geological Survey is carried in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, and is made available for the purpose of enabling the Survey to begin its work at the beginning of the season, when work is possible in that section.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. My impression is that they have funds enough for that, that the last appropriation lapped over, that there is enough over to keep the work going.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word in this connection upon the point of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. One moment, before the gentleman begins. Has this amendment been agreed to?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not. The amendment is pending and the gentleman from Indiana is recognized to debate the amendment.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] a couple of days ago made a point of order upon a similar provision in the bill, a provision authorizing the expenditure of money for the maintenance of the Washington-Alaska Cable Telegraph Line, and providing that the appropriation should be available until expended. The gentleman based the point of order upon the constitutional provision that authorizes the Congress of the United States to raise armies and to maintain them, and further provide that appropriations for that purpose shall not be for a longer period than two years at a time. The point of order was made against the provision contained in the section under consideration now, I infer, upon the same ground.

I do not want to allow this occasion to go by with the inference that might be raised from the condition the Record will be in—that is, that the point of order was sustained on the constitutional ground. The provision is clearly subject to a point of order under the rules of the House, because it does not limit the appropriation to the fiscal year for which this bill provides. The construction of military roads, of cables, and telegraph lines for purposes of common defense is in no sense the raising or maintaining of an army within the meaning of the Federal Constitution. An army is defined to be an organized band of armed men for purposes of offense or defense. This Government may spend money in the construction of military roads and forts and for purposes of common defense without having any army at all. I simply want to get my view in the Record in respect to this constitutional provision—that it does not apply to military roads and telegraph lines that are simply means of common defense and do not have reference to the Army in the sense of the constitutional limitation upon appropriations for the Army.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it not the gentleman's understanding that a military road and cable and telegraph lines are essential to the support of an army?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They are not essential to the support of an army, but they are regarded as a proper means of common defense, and they are proper in connection with the army for the purpose of increasing its efficiency.

But the Constitution gives Congress power to raise and support an Army, and provides that no appropriation of money for that use shall be for a longer term than two years, and the question now is, Has Congress the power to make an appropriation for a longer term than two years for the purpose of constructing military roads and military telegraph and cable lines? This proposition is academic. I simply want to put myself right in the Record in connection with the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will.

Mr. MANN. Under what provision of the Constitution do we derive authority to build these military roads in Alaska?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is an incidental power.

Mr. MANN. Incidental to what?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. To the common defense—to the public defense.

Mr. MANN. What provision does the gentleman find for the public defense?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is all through the Constitution.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman put it under the public welfare clause?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No; I do not. I put it under the inherent power the Government has to provide for common defense. If there was no provision in the Constitution respecting the raising and maintenance of armies, does the gentleman pretend to say this Government could not defend itself? I say it could.

Mr. MANN. I claim distinctly the power to raise and support armies authorizes the Government to transport an army, and the authority to transport an army carries with it the means of transporting the army. It may be a military road, and without that provision there would be no authority to build these roads, unless you put it under the public-welfare clause, and if you put it under the public-welfare clause this committee has no jurisdiction of the subject.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I am not discussing the question of jurisdiction; I am simply planting myself right upon the general proposition that this kind of an appropriation is not limited by the two-year Army clause; that is all. That is my judgment.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, for the moment I am glad to see the gentleman planting himself, although I think he is planting himself wrong on the proposition. Now, I do not undertake, and no one else will undertake, to say any appropriation expended by the War Department can not be made available for a period longer than two years, because the river and harbor appropriations are made available until expended, but they do not come in as a matter of support of the Army at all, whatever may have been the original theory, and as I said the other day and say now, here is a military committee reporting a privileged bill under a provision in the Constitution providing that appropriations for the raising and support of armies shall not be paid for a term longer than two years, and they entitle that bill "A bill for the support of the Army for the ensuing fiscal year." I do not know but we might put an item in that clearly would not be for the support of the Army. It would still have been subject to the point of order. Of course the provision the gentleman refers to was subject to the point of order in a number of different ways, and I suggested the other day, and suggest now, that it is very inappropriate in making an appropriation under the title for the support of the Army to put in a provision in violation of the clause of the Constitution authorizing an appropriation.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And that is the reason I took the floor, Mr. Chairman, to state that this particular provision was not in violation of the Constitution; that is all.

Mr. MANN. I am sorry to differ with such an able constitutional lawyer as the gentleman. I do not pretend to be his equal in that respect, but I have my own views.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the academic question between the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Indiana now having been settled, I want to say a word on this amendment by way of explaining the amendment which I propose to offer to this paragraph when the committee has acted upon the pending amendment. The conditions in Alaska in respect to employment of labor are peculiar and very unusual, unlike any conditions under which labor is employed anywhere else in the United States, and especially in reference to the work of constructing these military roads. This work is in the nature of exploring work. These roads are constructed in an uninhabitable and uninhabited wilderness, and during that season of the year in which the work is usually done they have daylight for practically twenty-four hours in the day. Under a recent decision of the Attorney-General the officers of the Army in charge if this work have been prohibited from allowing their men to work more than eight hours or from paying them for any time beyond the eight hours. Therefore, they have sixteen hours of idleness in a wilderness, and as I was told by one of these laborers who resides in my home city, last summer, who was employed on work in Alaska, at times the men almost go crazy for the want of something to do. It is not possible for us to fully comprehend the conditions under which these men work.

They are willing and anxious to work overtime, but are not allowed to do so. I do not propose by the amendment I intend to offer to change the existing law, except in so far as, in the opinion of the Attorney-General, that law prohibits the payment of wages to men when they work more than eight hours up in that country. Under the present law, as construed by the Attorney-General, this is impossible. As an act of humanity to the men employed in the construction of these military roads, the men who brave all of the dangers and hardships they must endure in that new and unexplored section of the country for the purpose of making these roads, we ought to give them the opportunity of making all that they can while they are there, and not compel them to waste so much of their time. When they are idle there are no amusements, nothing to occupy their time or their minds. They have nothing to do sixteen hours every day except to lie in black tents—the only tent that they use up there—loaf, and waste their time.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another side to this question, in addition to the advantage and comfort to the men employed on the building of these roads. To give them the opportunity would be economy to the Government.

We send these parties up into that wild country for the purpose of constructing these roads. They can not start until very late in the spring. They must travel for hundreds of miles before they reach the point where they will begin work. Then they are allowed to work only one-third of the time while there, and have nothing whatever to do when not at work. The season closes early, and they must return, so that if they could work as they want to and receive compensation for their overtime, as other men in the States receive compensation for their overtime, it would not only be an advantage to the men but it

would also be a great advantage to the Government in securing the completion of this work in much less time than otherwise will be required. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer this amendment: "That during the period between May 1 and October 1 each year it shall be lawful for laborers and mechanics employed upon the public works of the United States in the district of Alaska to work and receive compensation for work in excess of eight hours a day." This will not affect the eight-hour law or any laboring man in Alaska except those employed on the Government work herein authorized. It will not compel any man to work more than eight hours. It will merely permit him to do so and also permit him to receive pay for his overtime.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not now pending.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want the other amendment disposed of, but I wanted to explain the purpose of the amendment before the point of order was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I now offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 18, page 35, the following:

"That during the period between May 1 and October 1 each year it shall be lawful for laborers and mechanics employed upon the public works of the United States in the district of Alaska to work and receive compensation for work in excess of eight hours a day."

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to reserve a point of order and hear from the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. CALE] on that.

Mr. CALE. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise with the intention of objecting to the amendment at all. But I wish to put the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] right on one or two statements which he has made and which I do not believe represent the real facts as to that country. So far as the eight-hour system is concerned in Alaska, and my experience covers about eleven years in that country in working on the Government roads and on the roads and trails that we built before we had any Government to help build them, and also my experience in the mines, you can get equally as much service out of a faithful man in eight hours as you can get in ten. I will say as to my experience in employing men within the last three years in the mines, that our original method was to work our men ten hours a day; we finally changed from ten hours to eight hours, and I can assure you that we receive equally as good or better success from the eight-hour day than we did from the ten.

I think the gentleman is also mistaken in his remarks concerning people who are there during the sunshiny season of the year, and that there is so much time that there is daylight and that they are suffering on account of wanting to work, for the reason that any good man can do all the labor with pick and shovel, and that character of work, in eight hours that any reasonable man ought to expect him to do.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. CALE. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Does the gentleman know what the sentiment of the laboring men up there is, whether they desire to work longer than eight hours on public work?

Mr. CALE. I know the sentiment very well.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would like to hear the gentleman on that question.

Mr. CALE. I know the sentiment is entirely against it.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Against what?

Mr. CALE. The ten-hour system, or anything over the eight-hour system. They are in favor of the eight-hour system universally.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. And opposed to increased hours of work?

Mr. CALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Even for increased pay?

Mr. CALE. Even for increased pay they are opposed to it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I offer an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. A point of order is pending now. The amendment can be read for information.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have it read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. CALE] yield for that purpose?

Mr. CALE. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That eight hours shall be considered a day's work, and that payment for time in excess of eight hours shall be at a rate per hour equal to that paid per hour during the regular day.

Mr. CALE. I do not know that I caught the whole of that amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. It simply provides that eight hours shall be considered a day's work, and for any excess of that time the work shall be paid for at a rate not less than that paid for the regular day.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The gentleman from Alaska has the floor, and I ask that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. CALE. Certainly.

Mr. ADAIR. I wanted to ask you whether the laboring men in Alaska were not only opposed to ten hours a day, but whether they would be willing to work ten or more hours if they were paid for the excess of time that they worked. What is their wish in that respect?

Mr. CALE. Their wish is for an eight-hour system and eight hours' pay. There will be exceptions to that, of course.

Mr. ADAIR. But as a rule?

Mr. CALE. As a rule they favor the eight-hour system and eight hours' pay.

Mr. ADAIR. And do not desire to work longer?

Mr. CALE. They do not desire to work longer.

Mr. TAWNEY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman refers to the laboring classes of Alaska. The gentleman is aware of the fact that this proposed amendment does not apply, and will not apply, to any laboring men except those employed by the Government there for the construction of these telegraphic lines and in the building of these military roads in these interior districts.

Mr. CALE. I understand that.

Mr. TAWNEY. It does not at all, and it will not tend to change the law in any particular except as to these men who are employed outside of the mines, who are employed outside of civilization, who are employed outside of the settlements, where there is nothing whatever for them to do except work and spend sixteen hours a day in doing nothing.

Mr. CALE. I understand it.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman from Minnesota answer a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. I have not the floor. The gentleman from Alaska has the floor.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I hope the gentleman will be permitted to proceed.

Mr. ADAIR. I just wanted to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question, if the gentleman will allow me.

Mr. CALE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. I wanted to ask him if he had any personal knowledge as to whether the men employed on the Government work desire to work longer than eight hours?

Mr. TAWNEY. I have, so far as the Government work provided for in this bill is concerned.

Mr. ADAIR. From whom?

Mr. TAWNEY. From men employed in that work.

Mr. ADAIR. I would like to ask the gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAWNEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. CALE. Mr. Chairman, I might say in connection with what I have already said, and which has been referred to here, as to the long season that work is being performed, that depends largely upon the particular part of the Territory that you are in. Alaska, as you are aware, is a large Territory. In some parts of it we have nights every twenty-four hours. In the interior we have two or three months that is all daylight, and practically continual sunshine. So that the season that they begin work upon these military roads depends largely upon the particular territory in which the work is being performed. And the laboring people there, in the Government roads, favor an eight-hour system, for the reason that it gives a greater number of people employment. That is one of the particular reasons. Most of the people that go there do not go to work for wages. They are naturally prospectors and miners, and they have got to earn grubstakes and get supplies to go into prospecting. Whenever they get a sufficient amount earned for a grubstake they leave the road and everything else and go to prospecting. This system permits the Government to employ a greater number of men. That is probably all that I desire to say.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I make the point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clothing, and camp and garrison equipage: For cloth, woollens, materials, and for the manufacture of clothing for the Army, for issue and for sale at cost price according to the Army Regulations; for altering and fitting clothing and washing and cleaning, when necessary; for equipage, and for expenses of packing and handling, and similar necessities; for a suit of citizen's outer clothing, to cost not exceeding \$10, to be issued upon release from confinement to each prisoner who has been confined under a court-martial sentence involving dishonorable discharge; for indemnity to officers and men of the Army for clothing and bedding, and so forth, destroyed since April 22, 1898, by order of medical officers of the Army for sanitary reasons, \$7,000,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the preceding paragraph, entitled "barracks and quarters," which was read as I stepped to the door, I wanted to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill—

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to this discussion at this time? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I do not consent to going back for the purposes of amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous consent is to allow the gentleman from Minnesota to address the committee on this paragraph.

Mr. TAWNEY. I now ask unanimous consent that we may recur to the paragraph preceding the one which has just been read.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I shall have to object to that until I know what the gentleman desires.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to get some information from the gentleman.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa reserves the right to object.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say that I intended to offer an amendment to strike out the appropriation of \$271,000 for the purchase of land in the islands of Luzon, Mindanao, and Vizcaya. My attention was diverted for the moment and I did not notice that the paragraph had been concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to recur to the paragraph ending with line 13 on page 36, for the purpose of offering the amendment which he has indicated. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. YOUNG. I object.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is it not proper for me to move to return to the paragraph preceding the one that has just been read for the purpose of offering an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That can not be recognized at this time. The gentleman can only obtain permission to return by unanimous consent.

Mr. HULL of Iowa addressed the Chair and was recognized.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have received unanimous consent to ask the gentleman from Iowa some questions in regard to this transaction.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman did have that at one time. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] has now been recognized by the Chair.

Mr. TAWNEY. The consent has not been withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Another request was substituted, and objection was made to that request.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I have no objection to the motion to strike out. I desire simply to say that the estimate for additional land at Fort McKinley was in another estimate and not included in these provisions. It has not been recommended so far by the committee, although the War Department wanted us to recommend it.

Mr. MADDEN. It is not included in this paragraph?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No; this is the usual language, and simply provides for acquiring sites at places where it is necessary to place troops.

Mr. TAWNEY. But the total amount appropriated covers the estimate for the purchase of that land.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I beg the gentleman's pardon. He is right about that. The Department decided that they had the authority to buy the land if the appropriation was made.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the necessity for the purchase of the land which is proposed to be purchased?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. This is simply an informal discussion, although, so far as I am concerned, I am willing that the committee should pass on it. The options on the lands there will expire in a very short time, and they claim that they hold the land under this option at a better price than they can ever hereafter get it for. On page 241 of the hearings, Secretary Taft recommended this purchase and gave his reasons therefor.

Mr. SCOTT. Can the gentleman tell us how much is to be paid for this land?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It is for the enlargement of Fort William McKinley, near Manila. We have an option to acquire the land at what is regarded as a very low price.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is the gentleman aware that the same estimate was submitted to the Committee on Appropriations in the last session and refused?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No; I did not know anything about it.

Mr. TAWNEY. It was.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. But Secretary Taft says that—

It will make Fort William McKinley one of the best posts that we have in the Army. It is within 6 miles of Manila and connected with it by an electric railway and by river. The original purchase was not large enough. The original purchase is now filled with the post buildings, and this 6,000 acres next to it has been leased, with the privilege of purchase, which privilege, as I recollect correctly, expires some time in June. I think the cost is \$185,000.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. How much land have we now at Fort McKinley?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I can not answer. He says that the land now is entirely occupied by buildings and that there is no place for drills.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentleman know at what price per acre this land is to be purchased?

Mr. KAHN. The whole is to cost \$185,000.

Mr. SCOTT. At how much per acre?

Mr. KAHN. I can not tell that.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in the hurry of looking at this I was in error. I want to say that the gentleman from Michigan calls my attention to the fact that we did not put that in. We give the exact amount asked for in the estimates, which does not include Fort McKinley, and the \$185,000 is not included at all, but I think should be.

Mr. TAWNEY. But the committee does include the amount estimated for the purchase of land in the department of Luzon, \$211,000, and also for the purchase of land in Mindanao, \$40,000, and in Vizcaya, \$20,000, making a total of \$271,007, which added to the amount they want for rentals and repairs and new construction, makes a total of \$731,022.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. We do include the purchase of lands, but not for Fort McKinley. It is all set out in the hearings by the Quartermaster-General.

Mr. TAWNEY. I did not say for purchase of land adjacent to Fort McKinley; that was a statement by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. This is for many different posts scattered around throughout the islands. The gentleman from Minnesota is reading from the Quartermaster-General's report.

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. They set out what they want, but it is absolutely necessary that the Philippine Islands should have that right, or else it will be impossible to get posts located. If they have to send here in advance each time to have proper specific appropriations for the purchase of land, it will indefinitely delay the work.

Mr. TAWNEY. How many posts is it the policy of the Department to establish there?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. They have had about 400, but they are reducing them. Under the conditions of peace in the islands they will gradually reduce them and have larger camps and larger concentration of troops.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to call attention to the fact that for the same purpose the current appropriation this year is \$400,000, and that this is \$731,000, the exact amount estimated, including the purchase of new land, or \$331,000 in excess of the appropriation for the current year.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. If we strike out this provision, the right to purchase new land, you might as well cut out the larger part of the appropriation for barracks and quarters.

Mr. TAWNEY. They would have the same facilities they have now.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Not at all. They are establishing new posts, and they must purchase new land upon which to place them.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Iowa stated that there were 400 posts in the Philippine Islands. Can he state the number where the Government owns the land?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I suppose in a great many of the outside places, but as concentration goes on there will be fewer posts but more purchases.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are many of them on leased lands?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. There are small posts scattered everywhere where there happens to be necessity for troops; as that

condition disappears they are concentrated in larger units. That is shown in the pay for officers of the scouts. We have had to increase the officers for scouts. When they were in companies scattered all over the islands they did not have any majors, because they were not in battalions. But now they are organizing them into battalions, and so we have had to increase the number of officers, and it is necessary, according to the Department, to secure ground upon which to place the forts and also to erect the barracks and properly house the troops in the Philippine Islands.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That not to exceed the following sums may be used in the erection and completion of modern sanitary hospitals at the posts named: Thirty-five thousand dollars at Boise Barracks, Idaho; \$50,000 to enlarge the hospital at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; \$40,000 to enlarge the hospital at Fort Slocum, N. Y.; \$35,000 to enlarge the hospital at Fort G. H. Wright, N. Y.; \$25,000 to enlarge the hospital at Fort Robinson, Nebr.; \$20,000 to complete the hospital at Columbus Barracks, Ohio; and \$20,000 to complete the hospital at Jefferson Barracks, Mo.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that that paragraph, beginning at line 14, down to the bottom of the page, the proviso changes existing law, and also on the ground that the Committee on Military Affairs has not jurisdiction of the subject-matter of that proviso.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to argue the point of order except simply to say that the hospitals have always been under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can dispose of the point of order without reaching that point.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The permanent law of the country in regard to buildings is found on page 622 of the military laws, which provides:

Permanent barracks or quarters and buildings and structures of a permanent nature shall not be constructed unless detailed estimates shall have been previously submitted to Congress, and approved by a special appropriation for the same, except when constructed by the troops, etc.

The Chair has the law. It is a question that has been thrashed over very often, and my own judgment is that neither the Committee on Appropriations nor the Committee on Military Affairs has the right to appropriate for any building in excess of \$20,000 unless it is detailed in an explicit appropriation.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that under the head "military posts, for construction and enlargement at military posts of such buildings as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be necessary," there is estimated for the next fiscal year, to be carried in the sundry civil bill, \$1,581,000, and it is impossible for the House or the Committee of the Whole to know what these barracks and quarters and hospital buildings are costing the United States if they are to be carried in two appropriation bills, coming from two different committees. The Committee on Appropriations has always carried these provisions in regard to hospitals, and they are appropriations made to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of War. I insist that both grounds upon which the point of order is made are well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hold that the proviso is in conflict with the statute that the gentleman from Iowa has just read, so that the Chair must sustain the point of order without deciding the question of the jurisdiction of the two different committees.

Mr. MANN. Is that to the proviso?

Mr. TAWNEY. That is to the proviso.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I think there should be a very material reduction in the appropriation, if this goes out.

Mr. TAWNEY. The amount of the reduction is the aggregate amount stated in the proviso. I have not had time to foot it up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair might suggest that the Clerk be authorized to modify the title by reducing the amount by the amount named in the proviso.

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I ask that that be done.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to that procedure?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Quarters for hospital stewards: For construction of quarters for hospital stewards at military posts already established and occupied, including the extra-duty pay of enlisted men employed on the same, \$75,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order on that. Forty thousand dollars is what is carried in the current law, and there is \$75,000 in this item. I will reserve a point of order.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the question of quarters for hospital stewards is one that can all be stricken out or much more given than is given here, but as the policy of concentration is being carried on and a number of posts are increased in the country out of the small appropriations heretofore made, the Government has not been able to construct quarters for hospital stewards to meet the demand. The amount for each building is not in excess of \$20,000, and it is not near \$20,000. It has always been carried in this bill, and the only question is whether the amount carried here is too much or not.

Mr. TAWNEY. Can the gentleman inform the committee as to why the \$40,000 carried in the current law will not be sufficient to meet the requirements during the next fiscal year, and where is it proposed to expend the excess over the \$40,000 now carried?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman that the Surgeon-General has been wanting us to increase this amount for some years. He tried to have the Secretary of War submit larger estimates last year, but they were cut down. This year the Secretary of War said he felt he could not in justice cut them down. This provision will not complete the construction of quarters for hospital stewards. It will still require additional appropriations next year.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I think the Surgeon-General claims he could use to advantage \$150,000, if he could get the Secretary to submit the estimate.

Mr. KAHN. The Surgeon-General says that this amount is a necessity.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes; and this is a fair proposition, that where noncommissioned officers, like hospital stewards, are to have separate quarters, as provided for by law, and where a large number have, it is the duty of the Government as far and as rapidly as it can to comply with the allowance for hospital stewards and provide them their quarters.

Mr. MANN. Now, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Oh, certainly.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say last year and preceding years the Medical Department, the Surgeon-General's department, asked for more money and the Secretary of War reduced the estimate.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Last year.

Mr. MANN. Has the Secretary of War this year reduced any estimates made by any branch of the military service?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I can not answer that.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman could answer it; he may not be willing to answer it. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of War is so busy attending to public duties away from Washington that he has no opportunity to examine and reduce the estimates, which he has always done heretofore?

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the gentleman from Illinois make that request to his friend the Secretary of War.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman says rightly when he refers to him as my friend. I think he is one of the ablest men in the Government, and I have no doubt the genial gentleman at my left, the gentleman from New York, a year or so from now will be addressing him with much grace and suavity as the "President of the United States." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly shall, I hope, if the gentleman from Illinois is not then addressing my friend Mr. Bryan as "Mr. President." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to just call attention—I do not think the gentleman will press his point of order or that it is good—to where these quarters are to be, in answer to my friend from Illinois. There is to be one double set of quarters at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., to cost \$10,000; one double set at the Presidio, costing \$12,000, and the total amount that the Surgeon-General asked for in all places, and he insists they should have them at once, amounts to \$90,000. The committee recommended \$75,000.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] was called away, and he authorized me to withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Shooting galleries and ranges: For shelter, shooting galleries, ranges for small-arms target practice, repairs, and expenses incident thereto, such ranges and galleries to be open, as far as practicable, to the National Guard and organized rifle clubs under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, \$406,000: *Provided*, That \$16,324 shall be immediately available for completing the acquisition and construction of the rifle range at Fort Snelling, Minn.: *Provided further*, That \$250,000 shall be used only for the purchase of 6,000 acres of land, more or less, near the city of Washington, D. C., for use as a target

range, and for other military uses for regular troops, including field artillery, and for the National Guard of the District of Columbia and contiguous States.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order upon the second proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves the point of order as against the second proviso.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it is clearly subject to the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Yes; and it seems to me subject to a great deal of objection. Here is a proposition to buy 6,000 acres of land around Washington at \$41 an acre. Well, you can buy all the land around here you want at less than half that.

Mr. SULZER. Where?

Mr. MANN. Very close to here, and plenty of it.

Mr. SULZER. Down in the swamp?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I will, unless some explanation is given.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I can not give you an explanation as to price, but I can only give the explanation that is given in the hearings before the committee and the explanation that is given in the document to which the attention of the gentleman has been called, at page 469, where it is very strongly urged that this amount of land be purchased, as there is no place in the Department of the East where the Government owns a rifle range, even for small arms, and no place where a single battery of artillery can fire a gun without firing blank ammunition.

In the Department of the East something over a year ago General Grant secured from the department an organization of a board to examine and report upon a desirable site for this rifle range. That committee discharged its duties in full, and another committee was appointed to supervise and go over all that it had reported. If it is possible to secure land for what the gentleman says—less than half—the War Department ought to do it. I can only say it is exceedingly important for the Department of the East to have a rifle range. As to the possibility of our securing it at the figures the gentleman named, I have no information whatever which would lead me to believe it can be done.

Mr. MANN. Well, I am sorry the gentleman has no information. I know a great many people in this city who have bought land not very far from Washington in the last year or two at \$10 an acre, and it looks to me this might be possibly an undue temptation to somebody.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Well, there are some places around Washington which have been offered for a rifle range at a hundred an acre, and some for a good deal less, and some, according to report of Secretary, for a good deal more than the hundred dollars per acre. It is a large tract, and part of the land would evidently cost more than other parts.

Mr. MANN. Oh, very likely. Perhaps they intend to buy Mr. McLean's beautiful place out here, but I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I have no particular objection to the point of order. It is subject to it. If the gentleman has the remotest idea it is liable to be abused, if it is not sufficiently guarded, and would not be sufficiently guarded to insure all the rights of the Government being preserved, then I have not a word to say. I only want to say that in the opinion of the committee and of all parties that are interested in the question of administration of the Army the universal demand for the Government owning its own rifle range is conceded, and the longer it is delayed the more it will cost.

Mr. YOUNG. I wish simply to read a few words from the report of the Secretary of War upon this matter, in which he says:

I am not ordinarily inclined to be insistent, but so much and increasing difficulty has been experienced in getting target facilities that I can not rest content without stating that a range in the vicinity of Washington, D. C., is an imperative necessity. If such a necessity ever arises in administration of military affairs, it exists in this matter, and I feel that I must again, with all my force, urge favorable action to secure a target range in the vicinity of Washington.

Certainly no language can be stronger than that, and I wish to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that this matter will be in the hands of the Secretary of War; that it will be in the hands of a great and honorable Department of this Government, and if this land can be procured for any less money than we appropriate here undoubtedly it will be done. I believe that that matter can be safely intrusted to the Secretary of War, and I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if I thought that the Secretary of War himself would have the time during the next fiscal year to give personal attention to this matter I might feel somewhat differently. His communication to this Congress is dated

January 8, and I feel very confident that while he signed that communication he knows nothing about it personally. It is true there has been a lobby urging that this item should pass through Congress, because it is said that there has already been located the place where this money is to be expended. I do not know whether that be the case or not, but I do know that some people have been very much interested in having this item go through.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the gentleman permit a statement right there?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. YOUNG. I wish to say to the gentleman that if there has ever been such a lobby they have never approached the Committee on Military Affairs, and we have never heard from anyone upon this subject except the Secretary of War and his subordinates.

Mr. MANN. It is extremely likely, Mr. Chairman, that the gentlemen have at least never approached my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. Young], and if they had probably this item would not have been in the bill. But there are a great many ways of reaching the sale of a piece of property and obtaining an appropriation for it, and the most customary is to obtain the support of somebody in some Department beneath the superior officer. I do not say, and I would not charge, that there has been any improper motive on the part of any of the officials here, but it is true nevertheless that they can buy any quantity of land perfectly adapted for use in this connection around the city of Washington for less than half the price proposed to be paid by this appropriation, and under those circumstances it seems to me it would be well for at least another body to consider this, and better still if this committee could have an opportunity to consider it again, and for that reason I must insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I suppose the amount ought to be reduced, and I ask unanimous consent that that change may be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, line 11 will be amended by changing the amount, reducing it to \$250,000.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance of the Army War College: For supplying the necessary fuel for heating the Army War College building at Washington Barracks and for lighting the building and grounds; also for pay of a chief engineer, at \$1,200 per annum; an assistant engineer, at \$900; four firemen, at \$720 each; one elevator conductor, at \$720, \$12,700.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAIG] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, after line 5 on page 39, the following: "Encampments of organized militia with troops of the Regular Army: For paying the expenses of regiments, battalions, squadrons, and batteries of the organized militia of any State, Territory, or of the District of Columbia which may be authorized by the Secretary of War to participate in such encampments as may be established for the instruction of the troops of the Regular Army in seacoast defenses, as provided by sections 15 and 21 of the act of January 21, 1903, entitled 'An act to promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes,' \$700,000."

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order on that. That question was discussed fully.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] raises a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It is not germane to this part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman raise the point of order or reserve it?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I raise the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

Medical and Hospital Department: For the purchase of medical and hospital supplies, including disinfectants for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital ships, and transports; for expenses of medical-supply depots, for medical care and treatment not otherwise provided for, including care and subsistence in private hospitals of officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army, of applicants for enlistment, and of prisoners of war and other persons in military custody or confinement, when entitled thereto by law, regulation, or contract: *Provided*, That this shall not apply to officers and enlisted men who are treated in private hospitals or by civilian physicians while on furlough; for the proper care and treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army or at military posts or stations, including measures to prevent the spread thereof, and the payment of reasonable damages not otherwise provided for; for bedding and clothing injured or destroyed in such prevention; for the pay of male and female nurses, not including the nurse corps (female), and of cooks and other civilians employed for the proper care of sick officers and soldiers, under such regulations fixing their number, qualifications, assignment, pay, and

allowances as shall have been or shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War; for the pay of civilian physicians employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment and enlisted men, and to render other professional services from time to time under proper authority; for the pay of other employees of the Medical Department; for the payment of express companies and local transfers employed directly by the Medical Department for the transportation of medical and hospital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for analysis; for supplies for use in teaching the art of cooking to the hospital corps; for the supply of the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.; for advertising, laundry, and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Medical Department, \$700,000.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In connection with this paragraph, which is in relation to the Medical Department of the Army of the United States, I have recently had a letter from a most excellent physician in my district, calling my attention to a valuable article published in the New York Medical Journal, an old reliable journal, established in 1843. The article contains some suggestions upon the necessity of important changes in the organization of the Medical Department of the United States Army. I know this physician personally, and my experience has been with physicians generally, they take great interest in these matters and sometimes their ideas are exceedingly valuable. I ask permission of the committee, therefore, for the purpose of calling the attention of the Committee on Military Affairs and the War Department to the subject of the article, to print this article in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The article is as follows:

SOME OF THE TRIUMPHS OF SCIENTIFIC MEDICINE IN PEACE AND WAR IN FOREIGN LANDS, WITH SUGGESTIONS UPON THE NECESSITY OF IMPORTANT CHANGES IN THE ORGANIZATION OF THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

[By Louis Livingston Seaman, A. B., M. D., LL. B., F. R. G. S.—New York—Late Major Surgeon, United States Volunteer Engineers.]

If any doubting Thomas questions that the crowning glory of the profession of medicine is the prevention of disease rather than its cure, a visit to the American Tropics should convince him of his error. For centuries the continents, both north and south of the equator, have stood in constant dread of dysentery, bubonic plague, malaria, and yellow fever. Terrible epidemics of the latter have ravaged the coastwise cities in spite of rigid quarantines, for prior to 1902 the nature of its transmission was not understood, and effective quarantine was impossible where the *Stegomyia* mosquito thrived. Only a few years ago, in the harbor of Santos, thirty-one ships of almost every nationality rode at anchor for months without a living creature aboard, many of their masters and crews having fallen victims to "yellow jack," with little possibility of replacing them.

"Fifteen men on the dead man's chest,

Yo, ho, ho, and a bottle of rum,

Drink and the devil had done for the rest,"

only in this instance the devil was yellow fever, which was of such frequent occurrence as to scarcely excite surprise. The South American coast was dreaded by the mariner more than the Spanish main in the days of the pirate bold and the buccaner, so much so that the Lloyds often refused to underwrite vessels visiting these hotbeds of infection. But how is it to-day? Through the brilliant discoveries suggested by Finley, of Habana, and proved by the commission headed by Major Reed, the true method of its transmission was established and its eradication became a possibility, although in the prosecution of their experiments the majority of the members of the commission fell martyrs to the disease. What Doctor Wood, Doctor Reed, and Doctor Gorgas accomplished in its extinction in Habana and Santiago, and Doctor Gorgas repeated so effectually in the Canal Zone—as you heard him so graphically describe at a recent meeting of this academy—Doctor Cruz duplicated with even greater success in Bahia, Rio de Janeiro, and Santos, the most prolific culture grounds of the disease in the world, because their sanitary problems were there more difficult. Not until the last-named scientist was given absolute control in his own department, however, were his labors crowned with success. A terrible epidemic of the fever had visited Rio and Santos, the commerce of Brazil was paralyzed, the population of the cities decimated. Foreign capital was deserting, and the outlook was most gloomy. Millions of dollars were required for its extermination, and, after violent political opposition, Doctor Cruz was ultimately given control of his department, with correspondingly fortunate results, for in a comparatively short time the country was free from disease. He established an admirably equipped department of sanitation, with a corps of over 2,300 well-paid, uniformed men, whose sole duty was to fight yellow fever and bubonic plague, and who carried out their orders with almost as much celerity as the members of the fire department do in this city. Horses stood harnessed in their stables, ready to be hitched to ambulances and disinfecting carts, loaded with the necessary equipment for isolating cases and purifying the surroundings, so that the moment a new case was reported it was isolated by double screens, and the spread of the disease was effectually prevented. As a result, desirable immigration is no longer frightened away, foreign capital is flowing in to develop the limitless resources of the land, commercial interests have enormously increased, and the material and financial gains parallel those of humanitarian character. Brazil demonstrated the axiom that prevention is better than cure, and that, as a financial proposition, it pays to give the medical officer adequate authority in his own department.

The splendid work of Cruz in eradicating yellow fever has been equally successful in his campaign against bubonic plague, which for years had ravaged the coast with serious mortality. The final extinction of both these transmissible diseases in South America will soon be an accomplished fact, if the present policy of prevention and sanitation is maintained. In addition, Cruz established a school of experimental medicine in Rio, rivaling similar institutions in Europe and America, which will justly give Brazil an enviable position in the scientific world. A large corps of assistants are constantly occupied in the preparation of the various sera used in the prophylactic or curative treatment of bubonic plague, diphtheria, typhoid, and other diseases, and distributed over the country on the demand of physicians. The stables of the

animals used in the prosecution of this work are marvels of cleanliness, and in the operating room asepsis is observed as faithfully as in a modern hospital.

Rio de Janeiro maintains an excellent institution for the preparation of vaccine virus, also a medical college, which is to celebrate its centenary during this coming summer. It is admirably equipped with laboratories, especially for the study of hygiene and sanitation. Its Academy of Medicine is a most select body, and the walls of the lecture rooms of the college are graced with life-size portraits of its leading professors. Aseptic precautions are observed so carefully in some of the hospitals that operating arenas are separated by plate-glass partitions from the remainder of the room, so as to completely isolate them from contaminating atmosphere, where the students are seated.

The most serious defect observed in all the institutions of South America was the lack of trained nurses. Many of the hospitals in these old countries were formerly convents, and the labor of nursing was performed by the members of the various sisterhoods. These women, although often inspired by high motives, lack the skill necessary in the care of serious diseases, or for obtaining the best results in the after treatment of operations. And here I may be pardoned for a moment's digression to pay a word of tribute to my old traveling companion and friend, Dr. Nicholas Senn, whose sudden and lamented death recently shocked the world.

It was my privilege to circumnavigate the continents of Africa and South America with him, visiting the coastwise cities and hospitals en route, and penetrating through the jungle to the interior, wherever railway connections permitted.

While crossing the Peruvian Andes in September, near Lake Titicaca, 12,000 feet high, and La Paz, the highest city in the world, he was seized with the attack of soroché or mountain sickness that hastened his end. In passing from the Pacific Ocean through the Cordillerian and Andean ranges, over the great divide that separates it from the Amazonian slope, we rose to an altitude of nearly 3 miles in fifteen hours. The tremendous tension put upon the circulatory system in this already rarified atmosphere resulted in an attack of acute cardiac dilatation, with its distressing sequelæ, aggravated by bronchitis contracted in the Straits of Magellan.

To dwell upon the achievements of this great man would only be to repeat that with which the scientific world is already familiar. Aside from his remarkable originality in the field of surgery, Senn was a naturalist of deep learning, well versed in the flora and fauna of almost every land in the habitable globe. His fame was world-wide. His capacity for work exceeded that of any man I have ever known. He was a close observer, a conservative operator, an eloquent clinical lecturer, and in the emergency of war served his country faithfully and well. In his death America has lost an honored son, science a distinguished pioneer, and the world a gentle friend, whose fame will linger longest in the short and simple annals of the poor.

You have so recently heard of the brilliant results attained by Doctor Gorgas in the Canal Zone that a rehearsal of them is unnecessary. But the great lesson to be drawn from his splendid work was not pointed out at the time of his lecture. It must be remembered that during the first year of our occupation of the Panama district disease ran rampant, so much so that at one time the abandonment of the entire enterprise was considered. It was then proved that sanitation was the fundamental problem requiring solution, even before the engineering question could be solved. The original Isthmian Commission included no member of the medical profession, but was composed entirely of politicians and officers, ignorant of sanitation and hygiene, who ignored or so limited the authority of the chief sanitary officer as to render the enforcement of his regulations and measures impossible. This officer, Doctor Gorgas, was subordinated to the governor of the Zone, to the chief disbursing officer, to the chief of the bureau of materials and supplies, to a Mr. Grunsky, to the Commission, to the Secretary of War—subordinated, in fact, to the seventh degree from the source of authority—just about as the medical officer of the United States Army is, under the decrepit system under which he is compelled to serve to-day.

The chairman of the legislative committee of the American Medical Association, Doctor Reed, says:

"Here was Doctor Gorgas, recognized as the foremost authority in the world in the solution of the peculiar problems pertaining to tropical sanitation, subordinated to a series of other subordinates, all of whom were confessedly ignorant of the very question with which he was most familiar.

"The working of this wonderful mechanism," continues Reed, "is interesting. Thus, if Major La Garde, superintendent of Ancon Hospital, makes a requisition for supplies, he must make it in due form, take it for approval to the chief sanitary officer, then to the governor of the Zone, then to the chief disbursing officer, whence it goes to the Commission at Washington; then to the Mr. Grunsky as committee-man; then back to the Commission; then, if allowed, bids are advertised for; awards are made; the requisition is filed under the supervision of a purchasing agent notoriously ignorant of the character and quality of medical and surgical supplies; the material is shipped to the Isthmus, consigned to the chief of the bureau of materials and supplies, who notifies the disbursing officer, who notifies Colonel Gorgas, who in turn notifies Major La Garde, who applies to the quartermaster—the boss of a coral—for transportation, and, so much of the stuff as in the judgment of, first, the governor, next the chief disbursing officer, next the Commission, next, and more particularly, Grunsky, the committeeman, ought to be allowed to the superintendent of Ancon Hospital, finally arrives, or does not arrive at its destination, where the necessity for its use has probably ceased."

This is no fanciful picture; it is exemplified in practically every requisition that went forward and illustrates the tortuous course of the regular military channel as it now exists in the United States Army.

And what was the natural consequence of this wretched system of Panama? A costly epidemic—the death of some members of the Commission and of many laborers—a stampede of the remainder that threatened the success of the entire canal scheme and caused a delay of nearly a year in its completion, and the loss of interest on its heavy investment, that would have paid for the sanitation of the Zone for years. Not until the imminence of failure dawned upon the Washington authorities was a medical officer made a Commissioner, with authority to carry out his sanitary measures. The success resulting from this power being conferred upon our honored colleague again demonstrated the wisdom of making a medical man supreme in his own department; a truth Congress was for once forced to recognize.

Foreign governments foster their medical discoverers; ours does not. When Pasteur made his brilliant discovery of the microbe origin of disease and found the magic key that unlocked the secrets of infection, the French Government recognized his great work by placing him at the head of an institution under governmental patronage that enabled him to more successfully prosecute his experiments and researches. When

Koch discovered the bacillus of tuberculosis, he was a comparatively unknown country practitioner, but his Government placed him at the head of a department with abundant means to continue his work; it sent him to Africa to investigate the rinderpest, and after the successful solution of that problem sent him once more to the dark continent, where for the past two years he has been conducting a heroic battle against those dreaded diseases of the African Tropics, sleeping sickness and malaria.

In Africa I met Doctor Ollwig, Koch's chief assistant, who, in his scientific battle with malaria, is carrying out the two policies suggested from an etiological point of view: (1) The destruction of the anophelids by ridding the surrounding jungle as far as possible of its breeding places, and (2) the neutralization of the plasmodian parasites by hypodermic and internal administration of quinine, continued for many months. Favorable results have thus been obtained, although the difficulties of exterminating the mosquito have not yet been overcome. The period during which the infected *Stegomyia* continues as a source of danger in the transmission of yellow fever is limited to fifty days, whereas the infected anophelids retains its power of infection for three years, thus making the task of eradicating malaria far more difficult.

The results of Koch's investigations of tripanosomiasis are already well known to the medical profession. The infected tsetse fly is undoubtedly the most dangerous enemy of man and beast, where it exists, as up to the summer of 1906 the bite of an infected fly was invariably fatal. Its ravages in a belt of territory near Victoria Nyanza in the year we were there resulted in a fatality among the natives of over 200,000, many districts being almost depopulated. Horses, mules, cattle, antelopes, zebras, and wild buffaloes died in countless numbers. The zone of these depredations was rapidly increasing, and for that reason the German Government sent Professor Koch to study the habits of the fly and discover, if possible, a method for its extermination.

How does the Japanese Government look upon the health of its citizens? When Kitasato, after careful research and experimentation, discovered the bacillus of bubonic plague, the Government promptly rewarded him by placing him in charge of a great institution for the study of infectious disease, where the sera are made for the prophylactic and curative treatment of the most deadly disease of the country, and where much original investigation is being conducted.

In England every little town has an officer of health, appointed by the General Government to guard its citizens against disease.

Lister, Pasteur, and Koch opened the door to scientific research; but long before their day smallpox had been brought under control by the immortal Jenner. This loathsome disease would long ago have disappeared from the earth forever but for the ignorant attacks of fanaticism. As has been truly said: "Nothing has tended more to retard the advance of science than the disposition in vulgar minds to vilify what they can not comprehend."

Cholera and hydrophobia have been conquered by Pasteur, and Lister and Koch pointed the pathway to victory over the death-dealing microbes of transmissible diseases. Through their instrumentality disease has become the slave rather than the master of mankind. No longer do diphtheria, tetanus, septicæmia, typhoid, cholera, puerperal sepsis, hospital gangrene, erysipelas, and wound infection hold the world in dread.

Notwithstanding that in 1904 the victims of bubonic plague in India numbered 1,022,000, and in the first six months of 1907 reached the appalling number of 1,060,000, a scientific campaign of prophylactic sanitation would soon stamp out the last vestige of its existence were it not for the superstition of the natives which renders such a course impossible.

If scientific medicine has won these gigantic victories over disease, and in methods of prevention, in the last twenty-five years, what wonders of discovery may not be divulged in the coming centuries. Let us for a moment see what results have recently been accomplished by an intelligent application of scientific medicine in the field of war. Its last and most noteworthy application was in the great oriental conflict just concluded.

General Terauchi, Japanese minister of war, stated on November 23, 1905, in an address before the Red Cross Society of Japan, that "the total number of soldiers dispatched to the front during the war amounted to over 1,200,000, 80,000 of whom died and 300,000 fell sick. Of this vast number only about 9,300 died from wounds and 20,000 from sickness." This would leave the total from killed and battle casualties about 60,000; and from disease 20,000, or about one from sickness to three from casualties of war.

In April, 1906, a year after the last great battle had been fought, and when the totals were completed, Doctor Lynch (our military attaché in Japan during the war) in his report to our War Department published the following official figures:

TABLE I.

Killed in battle and died from wounds	58,887
Died from disease	27,158

Total died..... 86,045

or more than twice as many from battle casualties as from disease.

The records of extended campaigns for the past two hundred years, as shown in the Standard Tables of Longman and elsewhere, are that four men have died from disease to one from bullets. These figures of the Japanese army, therefore, constitute the most remarkable series ever published in the history of wars. Almost similar figures have been unwarrantably contradicted by officers of the United States Army, but the report of Major Lynch, our own medical attaché, just published with official records down to April, 1906, can not be challenged.

In another table our military attaché states that in the Japanese war with China, in 1894, for every man who died from wounds 12.09 died from disease. In the war with Russia, ten years later, for every man who died from wounds, 0.46 died from disease, or one twenty-seventh as many.

In their titanic conflict the Japanese kept over 600,000 men in the field for over a year and a half; they fought some of the greatest battles of history, one of twelve days of incessant conflict and another of sixteen days; skirmish fighting went on constantly during the entire period of hostility. In their campaigns the soldiers had their camp kettles, water boilers, blankets, and mosquito nets, and every man was protected by a net during the mosquito season. Their casualties have been nearly 40,000 in a single battle, or twice the entire number of soldiers we sent to Cuba, and yet every man was promptly, carefully, and scientifically cared for. They fought through a country where unsanitary conditions prevailed, often camping on the germ-infested sites of their enemies, and yet, by the incessant precautions of a numerically adequate medical corps, with power to enforce sanitation and hygiene, the army was enabled to make a health showing unheard of before in the annals of war.

In contrast to this picture let me for a moment invite your attention to the Porto Rican expedition in that opera bouffe performance known as the Spanish-American war, for nowhere in history is there found a more illuminating instance, a graver lesson, or a more terrible warning than is here portrayed. For our country is the "Mene, mene, tekkel eupharsin," the handwriting on the wall, so easily decipherable that he who runs may read, and yet, in the glory of victory and the enjoyment of prosperity, its lesson has passed unheeded.

The story of the expedition is brief. About 20,000 American troops landed in Porto Rico, while the Spanish on the island numbered about 17,000. Several skirmishes occurred, in which, according to the Surgeon-General's report, three men were lost from the casualties of war. The object of the war, the breaking of the chains of Spanish despotism and spoliation, which for centuries had held a race in shameful moral serfdom, was soon accomplished, and the war—from the strictly military standpoint—was over. From our first arrival, the natives of the island welcomed our battalions with vivas of applause, strewing our advancing march with flowers, and their masses were prepared to joyfully second our efforts for their more complete emancipation.

That is the beautiful story that history presents. Let us forget, as a nation, and lie supine in the easy content of this picture, let me invite your attention for a moment to a further study of the report of the Surgeon-General for that war. It states that although three men only fell from the casualties of battle during that entire campaign, 262, or nearly one hundred times as many, died from preventable causes. It falls, however, to state that the number of hospital admissions nearly equaled the entire strength of the invading army, and that the camps of the army from one end of the island to the other were pestiferous hotbeds of disease before they had been occupied a month, so that had the bugle sounded for action only a small percentage of the units would have been in a condition to respond to the call. Nor was this state of affairs confined to Porto Rico. In the invading armies of the Philippines and Cuba the same conditions prevailed. The official figures, as shown in Table II, were furnished by the Surgeon-General of the Army on the 10th day of October, 1905, and cover the vital statistics of the United States military expeditions for the year 1898.

TABLE II.

	Deaths from—	
	Battle casualties.	Disease.
In the Philippine Islands.....	17	203
In Porto Rico.....	3	262
In Cuba.....	273	567
In the United States home camps, etc.....		2,649
Total deaths.....	293	3,681

or about one from casualties to fourteen from disease.

The report further shows that while the average mean strength of the Army enlisted for the Spanish war was about 170,000, the total number of admissions to the hospitals was on September 10, 1898, over 158,000, or 90 per cent. This in a war of less than three months' duration, and in which more than three-fourths of its members never left the camps of their native land. The Japanese army for the same period had about 4 per cent hospital admissions, or one twenty-second as many.

The vast difference in the Japanese figures illustrates the value of a medical and sanitary department properly equipped to enforce practical sanitation, dietary, and conservative surgery.

The splendid achievements of scientific medicine in civil life in the prevention of disease should be even more effectually obtained in the Army, where only healthy men are accepted, and vigorous outdoor camp life should keep its units, who are subject to strict military discipline, in perfect physical condition. Health alone, however, is no guaranty against the insidious attack of the silent foe that lingers in every camp and bivouac. It is this foe, as the records of wars for the past two hundred years have proved, that is responsible for four times as many deaths as the guns of the enemy, to say nothing of the vast number temporarily invalidated or discharged as unfit for duty. It is this dreadful unnecessary sacrifice of life from preventable disease that constitutes the hell of war. In every great campaign an army faces two enemies. First, the armed force of the opposing foe, with its various machines for human destruction that is met at intervals in open battle; and, second, the hidden foe, always lurking in the camp, the specter that gathers its victims while the soldier slumbers in barrack or bivouac—the far greater, silent foe, disease. Of these enemies the history of warfare for centuries has proved that in extended campaigns the first or open enemy kills 20 per cent of the total mortality, while the second or silent enemy kills 80 per cent. In other words, out of every hundred men who fall in war, twenty die from the casualties of battle, while eighty perish from disease, most of which is preventable.

TABLE III.

	Battle casualties.	Disease.
In the Russo-Turkish war the deaths were.....	20,000	80,000
In the six months of the Crimean campaign, as is asserted on eminent authority, the losses of the allied forces were.....	20,000	50,000
In our war with Mexico the proportion was.....	1 to 3	
In our civil war about the same proportion.....	1 to 3	
In the French campaign in Madagascar in 1894 of 14,000 sent to the front, 29 were killed in action and over 7,000 perished from preventable disease.....	29	7,000
In the Boer war in South Africa the English losses were about.....	1 to 10	
In our war with Spain 14 lives were needlessly sacrificed to ignorance and incompetency for every 1 who died on the firing line or from the result of wounds, the figures being.....	293	3,681
In the Russo-Japanese war the figures were ^a	58,837	27,168

^a Or more than 2 from battle casualties to 1 from disease, thus reversing the records of all wars for the past 200 years.

The difference between the martyr and the victim, between the soldier who falls on the field of honor and the man who meets a miserable death from preventable disease, for which his government is criminally responsible, is as wide as the celestial diameters. The one meets death compensated in the thought that his life is given in the protection of his country's flag and honor; the other is ignominiously forced to his grave through the neglect of the government that shamefully fails to protect the life he offered in its defense.

That the monstrous sacrifice of 80 per cent is almost totally unnecessary has been abundantly proved in the records of the Japanese war, where 1,200,000 men were sent to the front, in a country notoriously unsanitary, and only 27,000 men died from disease, to 59,000 who fell in the legitimate line of duty on the field of honor. In the Army of the United States in 1898 2,649 picked soldiers died in three months, without leaving the country, in the pest camps of this, their own native land.

Unless an army maintains a thoroughly organized sanitary corps, prepared to fight germs and diseases in advance of the fighting forces, testing the water supplies, and avoiding the dangers from contagion and infection, the medical department might as well be abolished. If the Japanese had not realized this before their last war and taken measures to prevent disease, their army would never have won their brilliant and uninterrupted series of victories. If they had sustained the same ratio of mortality from sickness as in their war with China ten years before, their losses from disease alone in the Russian war would have nearly equaled the total of their entire losses from all causes. This proves the value of the medical and sanitary corps, and illustrates its importance as a factor in the winning of the final issue.

The days of operative surgery on the field of battle or at the front passed with the discovery of asepsis and antiseptics. The Russo-Japanese war taught many lessons and destroyed many ideals in matters military as in matters surgical, where the hitherto accepted idea of the duties of the military surgeon was shown to be erroneous, where asepsis and antiseptics relegated the use of the scalpel to comparative obscurity and demonstrated conclusively that preservation of the army by prevention of disease is the surgeon's duty, first, last, and nearly all the time. In surgical technique, or in the after treatment of the wounded and sick, the Japanese taught the foreigner comparatively little, but in the field of sanitary science and dietetics they demonstrated, what had never been done before, viz, that preventable diseases are preventable and can be controlled and that the great incubus of an army in the field—the presence of crowded hospitals and the large and expensive force necessary to equip and conduct them—can to a large extent be eliminated.

It is a sad reflection on our civilization that, while we regard as essential separate Departments of State, Agriculture, and War in the Executive Cabinet at Washington, and issue bulletins for public distribution on swine cholera, cabbage culture, and crop reports, principally used by speculators, we deliberately ignore the safeguarding of our people from the horrors of infection and contagion. While the rest of the world has been making these splendid advances in the humanities, America—except in institutions fostered by private philanthropy—has stood in stolid indifference, doing little to stem the tide of destruction. We have allowed the wreckage and waste to go on, to cripple the energy with which we must challenge the future.

The relation of our Federal Government to public health has assumed some national importance, and if the efforts of the various medical societies of the country, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Museum of Safety Devices, various insurance, accident, and allied associations, are successful, it may receive a little more recognition. The paramount want is for a national board of health with a secretary in the Cabinet of the President.

If this can not be secured, a more liberal policy toward the national bureau of health connected with the Marine-Hospital Service is much to be desired. Through an extension of the services of this organization the death rate of the country may be enormously decreased—possibly to the extent of one-third to one-half—and the general health of the community benefited by the eradication or amelioration of disease from preventable causes. But, as Doctor Walsh recently stated: "If the millions spent for the extermination of hog cholera during the last decade had been spent for the preservation of the public health, we should be far ahead of where we are to-day."

In the light of modern and sanitary science there is little excuse for the enormous losses by illness and death through typhoid, diphtheria, scarlet fever, cholera infantum, and dysentery, all of which are preventable. The names of these diseases do not inspire the same terror as bubonic plague, yellow fever, cholera, and smallpox, but their victims are just as dead, and their bereaved are just as desolate. And these diseases might be stamped out quite as effectually as the others, with proper enforcement of sanitary precautions.

It is stated that the appointment of a secretary of health in the President's Cabinet and the enforcement of regulations for the public health would interfere with the rights of States, but do the germs of cholera and yellow fever and tuberculosis and bubonic plague and measles respect State lines? And do streams polluted with cholera and typhoid bacilli cease to flow at State borders? Interstate commerce is not considered as an interference with State rights; then why should interstate disease be so regarded?

Prior to the enactment of the pure-food laws, which are now producing such beneficial results in the preservation of the public health, the same argument was advanced, but the passage of the act, instead of restricting the States, has induced them to enact similar or even more drastic laws in the same line; and no one objects—except the manufacturer or seller of adulterated products.

The estimation in which the authorities at Washington hold the only national institution we have for the preservation of the public health was recently evidenced by the efforts of a late member of the Cabinet to abolish or restrict the work of the Marine-Hospital Service on account of its expense. Many kinds of fools are required in the making of a world, but the American who would seriously advise the abolition of this last-named institution combines in his single self the whole "fifty-seven varieties."

Disease is an enemy that causes more fatalities in a year than the combined armies of the world do in a century. As well might a general in an enemy's country abolish his pickets and outposts as for America, with its extensive coast lines, its foreign commerce, and its enormous immigration to do without its Marine-Hospital Service. I have seen these zealous guardians of our public health in almost every port with which we have commercial relations, always watchful lest contagious or infectious diseases might elude them and fasten on our native land, and with a fairly liberal personal experience and knowledge of our Government in its various Departments at home and abroad,

I assert that the United States Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service is the one Department of which Americans have most reason to feel justly proud. Instead of restricting its powers, they should be amplified; instead of cutting down its appropriation, it should be increased. In no Department of our Government does the nation receive better returns on its investment, even though some of the mentally myopic politicians of the present Administration fail to discover it.

And this argument applies with equal force to the Medical Department of the Army. We go on expending nearly half a million dollars a day for the maintenance of our military schools, the education of men in the art of war, and the manufacture of machines for human destruction, and in the plant necessary for putting these machines into execution, while the study of the equally important subject of prevention of disease—the foe that kills four times as many as the enemy's bullets—is left comparatively unheeded. Every death from preventable disease is an insult to the intelligence of the age; if it occurs in an Army, it becomes a governmental crime. The State deprives the soldier of his liberty, prescribes his hours of rest, his exercise, equipment, dress, diet, the locality in which he shall reside, and in the hour of danger expects him, if necessary, to lay down his life in defense of its honor. It should therefore give him the best sanitation and the best medical supervision that the science of the age can devise, be it German or Japanese—a fact of which Congress will do well to take cognizance before it begins another war. For just as surely as the engineer who disregards the signals, or the train dispatcher who gives wrong orders, is legally responsible for the loss of human life in the wreck that follows, so Congress, or the wretched system of the Medical Department of its Army, is responsible for the thousands of soldiers' lives needlessly, criminally sacrificed—not on the glorious field of battle, but in diseased camps—from preventable causes. I believe that if the medical department of the Porto Rican expedition had been properly systematized, with sufficient numbers, with supervisory control over the ration, and with power to enforce sanitary and hygienic regulations, the units of that army would have returned to their homes at the close of the campaign in better physical condition than when they had entered it, improved by their summer outing.

The Medical Department of our Army, whose archaic system almost parallels that of Peking, while falling far below that of Patagonia (and I am familiar with both and speak advisedly), although unequal to cope with the exigencies of the Spanish campaign, is to-day, as the Surgeon-General states, relatively 50 per cent worse off in numbers than at the close of the civil war in 1864 or at the termination of the Spanish-American campaign. The theory upon which it is founded—that the cure of disease rather than its prevention is its objective—still remains in vogue. Although men of brilliant attainments and individual merit are found on its staff, the deplorable system under which they are compelled to serve, and their lack of authority to enforce sanitation and hygiene, render the advisability of the continuance of the Department under present conditions problematical. If it had been totally abolished during the Spanish-American war and the Army placed under the control of the health department of this city, with such an officer as Colonel Waring or its present incumbent in charge, there would not have been such a disgraceful and infamous record. And why? Simply because that department would have had authority to enforce the orders respecting sanitation, diet, and hygiene, and would have assured the safety of the troops.

Under the present system the same old medical regulations remain in vogue, to all intents and purposes, as prevailed before the microbic origin of disease was discovered and the key to sanitation found. So that, if another war were to be declared next summer, our Government would again convert the units of its Army into hospital patients and its veterans into pensioners.

The deplorable collapse of the Medical Department in the Spanish war resulted in the introduction into Congress of a measure to increase its efficiency. The essential features of this bill are merely to increase the commissioned personnel of the medical corps, thereby abolishing the present system of employing contract surgeons, to afford an adequate flow of promotion, and to establish a so-called "medical reserve corps," recruited from recent graduates, who, after examination, may be listed as available for service in time of war. No provision, however, is made for the instruction or training of these reserves.

As a measure of true reform the bill is hopelessly deficient in most essential features. It makes no provision for that most important of all adjuncts, an adequate sanitary department. One keen, up-to-date sanitarian, thoroughly skilled in hygienic, dietetic, and bacteriological knowledge, and armed with the necessary authority to enforce sanitary measures, is worth a hundred so-called "surgeons," to an army in the field, restricted, as they now are, by red tape and lack of authority in matters relating to their special department. No provision is made for an independent transport system, nor are medical officers given advisory authority over the Commissary Department or the soldiers' ration. A regiment may be suffering from diarrhea or intestinal catarrh (and I have seen 90 per cent of an entire command in this condition at one time), compelled to live on a diet of pork and canned beans and fermenting tomatoes until they became hospital cases. Up to this time, the medical officer has no authority to even order a rice diet, which would have prevented the men from becoming invalided. This was one of the principal causes that brought our Army of 170,000 men in the Spanish war almost to its knees in the three months, and sent them home in the shrunken and shriveled condition well remembered by many here to-night.

Under the present system the line officer of the Army is under no obligation to accept the recommendation of the medical officer as to the site or sanitation of a camp. Even in time of peace he has no executive power to enforce sanitation, although he may be convinced that the health of every man is being jeopardized.

I quote from a letter received last week from a prominent medical officer in the Philippines. He says:

"Recently a post commander, without the knowledge of his medical officers, gave permission to a native to dam up a stream on the reservation. The post had been kept free from mosquitos and malaria only by the utmost vigilance. The medical officers protested personally, officially, and by special sanitary reports, but to no purpose. Almost every house soon became infected, one of the surgeons lost his wife, and there were over forty cases. Finally a new post commander tore out the dam. The post was Camp Daraga."

One would suppose that every effort of the medical officers to maintain the health and vigor of the fighting units would be welcomed, and all the authority necessary to keep them so would be gladly accorded by the officers of the line, so in the reality of battle the men would be in the best physical condition. But this is not the case.

The officers of artillery, of cavalry, of infantry, the engineers, and of the signal service, can compel obedience to their orders, but the med-

ical man, whose department fights the foe that has killed 80 per cent in the majority of the great wars of history, can not enforce an order, but can only make a recommendation, which the line officer can accept or reject at his discretion.

The bill ignores the pressing need for medical inspectors and contains no provision for the establishment of a department of pharmacy. This should have at its head a commissioned officer like the late Dr. C. C. Rice, of Bellevue, with commissioned subordinates, as is found in several of the best-organized armies abroad. It should be charged with the purchase and distribution of all medical supplies, the sterilization and care of all surgical instruments, first-aid materials, and the care of hospital records. This would relieve the medical officer of the complicated system of bookkeeping, invoicing, and other similar work that now makes him little more than a property clerk and decreases his value as a physician in ratio to the time he remains in service and wastes the valuable hours he should devote to the legitimate duties of his profession. The civil practitioner gave up the practice of toting his pills and powder when the scientific pharmacist appeared; but Congress, apparently unaware of this adjunct to the medical art, still compels the Army surgeon to peddle his shop wherever he goes, and holds him personally and financially responsible and liable for every item of equipment of the hospital and drug department of which he has charge, be it base, field, or post hospital.

Wherein is the fault of the present system? First and foremost, in the faulty organization of the Medical Department. The rank of Surgeon-General should be commensurate with the importance of the Department of which he is the head. Under a proper system this officer should be responsible only to a national secretary of health, who should be a Cabinet officer, to the Secretary of War, or to the President, and there should be conferred upon him and his subordinates authority in all matters of sanitation and hygiene, except in the emergency of battle, when, of course, all authority should devolve on the officers of the line.

The importance of the medical, as compared with the other staff departments, has never been recognized or appreciated. Until it is realized that the most important function of the medical officer is in the prevention of disease rather than its cure the old custom will prevail. To be efficient, the medical officer must not only be a good physician, but a sanitarian, a bacteriologist, often a chemist, as well as an administrator. Upon him devolves the duty of preventing disease, and his part in maintaining the effectiveness of the units makes him an important factor in the military establishment. His status is essentially military, not in the sense of holding command, but as an integral part of an organization complex in its composition, and whose different members should be so organized as to produce a harmonious and effective whole. Under the existing system he is looked upon simply as a doctor, whose sole function is treating the sick and wounded—whose duties should be confined to the hospital, and whose recommendations should be submitted only when asked for.

In all the wars in which the United States have engaged disease has been responsible for more than 70 per cent of the mortality, more than one-half of which could have easily been prevented had the Medical Department been properly organized and equipped. Preventable disease more than wounds swells the pension lists. Statistics of the Pension Office prove that if this unnecessary loss had been avoided the saving in pensions alone would have paid the cost of the resulting war every twenty-five years. Aside from the sorrow of the homes made desolate, consider the economic value of the 70 per cent of lives now uselessly sacrificed that might be saved as breadwinners in industrial pursuits.

The entire appropriation of the Medical Department for the fiscal year of 1898 was less than \$1,000,000; this was increased at the outbreak of hostilities with Spain by something over \$2,000,000. Then came the war. As a result of that almost bloodless conflict, the actual hostilities of which lasted only less than six weeks, we paid last year alone \$3,471,157 in pensions, with the further assurance of an annual increase for many years to come. The rolls of the Pension Office to-day bear the names of 24,000 pensioners, over 19,000 of whom are invalids and survivors of this war, and over 18,000 additional claims are now pending, although the total of the Cuban army of invasion was only 20,000 men. Last year we paid in pensions a total of \$146,000,000; this year the appropriation estimated for has increased to \$151,000,000. Are the fatalities of the past to be dismissed from the equation of the future? Instead of repeating our own blunders, why not emulate the successes of others? Possibly the recent action of the Executive in placing a medical officer in command of a hospital, although that hospital chanced to be afloat, may indicate a ray of hope.

It is far from certain, however, that Congress alone is responsible for the deplorable system of our Medical Department. Why does not the Surgeon-General demand from Congress all that is required to make the department really effective, even though the needed appropriation may be increased tenfold? Why does he not marshal his facts and figures and present them in illustration of the suicidal policy of allowing this great waste from preventable disease, thereby demonstrating the value of the medical man as a financial asset? Why does he not show that his department could pay for itself many times over in the annual saving of pensions now resulting from its neglect—that statistics prove this loss amounts every twenty-five years to more than the cost of the war that caused it? Why does he not show the enormous increase in the efficiency of the Army that would result from having fighting men instead of invalids in its ranks? Also the enormous economic value of the lives of the 70 per cent now wasted that might be saved to their families as breadwinners instead of invalids and pensioners? Then let Congress refuse his demand, if it dare assume that responsibility. The liberality and generosity of our nation to its pensioners prove we are not always actuated by base or sordid motives; and if Congress or the American people could be convinced of the necessity for these reforms there would be little difficulty in obtaining their enactment.

Permit a moment's digression to narrate the personal experiences of a soldier, a member of the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States, which occurred within sight of the Dome of the Capitol at Washington. He writes:

"MY DEAR SEAMAN: On May 1, 1898, my regiment was sent from our home station to Homestead, L. I., for reorganization from a national guard regiment to a regiment of volunteers for service in the war with Spain. Our hospital corps of trained men was taken from us, as well as our medical supplies and instruments, and the regimental staff of three surgeons was reduced to one, with the rank and pay of a first lieutenant—rather short-handed for a full regiment of 1,333 men. Early in July I was detailed as sanitary inspector of the Army corps to which we were attached, as typhoid fever was breaking out rapidly in every organization attached to the corps.

"My instructions were to inspect all camp sites, sinks, water supply, drainage, food, method of cooking, etc., and report in writing to the

chief medical officer of the corps daily. I assumed the duties with great zeal, for sanitary problems had long been a favorite study, as I had been chief medical officer of my home city, with its population of nearly 400,000, for six years.

"There was at that time a young man in my regiment who formerly belonged to my hospital corps, a graduate of Cornell University, who had taken a post-graduate course in analytical chemistry and was well qualified for chemical and bacteriological work; also a private in a hospital corps detachment, encamped near us, who a few days before his enlistment had returned from Germany, where he had been a student and assistant in Koch's laboratory for four years. A valuable microscope was found in the first division of the hospital, which, as it was not used there, we were assured we could have.

"A list of the required material was prepared, with a probable cost of less than \$50, and everything looked favorable for a successful inauguration of my plan. I accordingly drew up a communication to the chief medical officer of the corps, outlining the proposed work, showing how we could analyze suspected foods and water, make the Widal test, blood counts, etc., and do such other work as would naturally present itself. I also informed him that all details had been arranged, and the only thing required to inaugurate the work at once was the proper orders from corps headquarters. It is impossible to express my surprise and disappointment when my plan was returned 'disapproved,' giving as the reason that the men whom I had selected to do the scientific work were not commissioned officers, but only enlisted men, and that 'it would violate all the traditions of the Army to do this work in this manner,' and that 'it was useless to establish a bacteriological laboratory in the field, as it could be of no practical benefit.' In vain I pleaded the urgent need of the hour, that the work could be done in my name, or even in the name of the chief medical officer, but all to no purpose. The plan for the scientific work was thoroughly 'sat down on.'

"I then respectfully asked what plan could be substituted, and was informed that application would be made for a detail of contract surgeons, especially qualified, who would aid in the work as outlined. My zeal, acquired as an old national guard officer, subsided, and I plodded on in my work, looking on and seeing preventable disease sweeping away our soldier boys, and nothing, absolutely nothing, being done to find the source of the infection or prevent its spread.

"The summer passed, the war was over, taps had been sounded over the graves of hundreds of brave boys who had never heard the hum of a hostile bullet, and early in September we were ordered to our home station to be mustered out.

"It was a beautiful Sunday morning, and the site where more than 20,000 men had been encamped was practically deserted. I could hear the sound of the drums and bugles coming faintly through the woods as the regiment marched to the railroad. I lingered at the site of the first division hospital with an ambulance to bring the last of our sick away, when my orderly informed me that an officer wished to see me, and pointed to a man seated on a stump near by. I approached him and was informed that he was a contract surgeon, sent by the Department to report for bacteriological work. I told him that I was glad to see him, but that the war was over, that such of the soldiers who had not died of disease were now on their way home to be mustered out, and that I hoped he would stick to his post, so he would be ready for service when the next war broke out."

And there is nothing in the medical bill now before Congress to keep that man on the stump, so he may be ready when the next war does come, or for his substitute in case he, too, may have joined the great majority before that time.

Is the great medical profession—a profession that in one of the bloodiest wars of history has contributed so largely in reducing the mortality of deaths from disease—to remain subservient to the dictates of the variety of judgment just cited, or is its department in our Army to be reorganized upon rational lines, and its personnel empowered to enforce its mandates, so that the medical and moral rights of the soldier may be safeguarded and the country receive the benefit of his protection?

Boast as we may of our national patriotism and philanthropy, our altruism in freeing Cuba from the tyranny of Spain and in elevating the status of that bunch of trouble, the Philippines, our foreign missions, and our great systems of charity at home, the cold, clammy fact remains that the sons of Nippon in their war with Russia treated their prisoners with far more humanity than our nation does its own soldiers.

In the great oriental conflict just concluded not once did the Muscovite win a victory, but from the Yalu to Mukden was driven from the field and often left to his victors the care of his sick, his wounded, and his dead. Sixty-seven thousand sick Russian prisoners were brought to Japan from Manchuria and nursed back to health. And to the eternal credit and glory of Japan let it be remembered that from the first-aid dressing on the firing line to the transport, the subsistence, the medical care, and the gentle nursing in her home hospitals, no difference was made between the treatment of her own soldiers and those of the enemy. Therefore, without minimizing the splendor of her victories on land or sea, at the Yalu, Port Arthur, Mukden, Shaho, Laloyang, or with Togo at Tshushima, the fact remains that Japan's most splendid evolution and her greatest triumphs have been in the humanities of war. By careful preparation and organization the use of simple, easily digested rations for her troops, and the application of practical sanitation by a fully equipped and empowered medical department, she almost obliterated infectious and preventable diseases from her army and saved its units for the legitimate purposes of war, to wit, the smashing of the enemy in the field. She reduced the mortality in her own army by over 80 per cent, and treated her prisoners with a charity and consideration heretofore unheard of in the history of war, and established a standard in the humanities which the rest of the civilized world will do well to attain.

Let us hope that the day is not distant when the true value of the medical man in war will be appreciated in our own land and will be given the authority in his own sphere that will make it possible for our Army in the day of emergency to equal, if not surpass, this splendid record. Braver men never served with the colors than the American soldiers, as we proved on both sides of the civil war, where many battles (in one of which, at Cold Harbor, 10,000 men fell in ten minutes) exceeded anything known in the Orient, and where it was conclusively proved that our soldier deserves every care and protection a generous Government can bestow.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment correcting the punctuation.

Line 8, after the word "disinfectants," insert a comma; in line 12, after the word "hospitals," insert a comma; line 22, after the word "for," when it first occurs, insert a comma.

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Engineer School, Washington, D. C.: Equipment and maintenance of the Engineer School of Application at Washington Barracks, D. C., including purchase of instruments, machinery, implements, models, and materials, for the use of the school and for instruction of engineer troops in their special duties as sappers and miners; for land mining, pontooning, and signaling; for purchase and binding of professional works of recent date treating of military and civil engineering and kindred scientific subjects, for the library of the United States Engineer School; for incidental expenses of the school, including fuel, lights, chemicals, stationery, hardware, machinery, and boats; for pay of civilian clerks, draftsmen, electricians, mechanics, and laborers; for extra-duty pay to soldiers necessarily employed for periods not less than ten days as artificers on work in addition to and not strictly in the line of their military duties, such as carpenters, blacksmiths, draftsmen, printers, lithographers, photographers, engine drivers, telegraph operators, teamsters, wheelwrights, masons, machinists, painters, overseers, laborers; for repairs of, and materials to repair, public buildings, and machinery; for unforeseen expenses, for travel expenses of officers on journeys approved by the Chief of Engineers and made for the purpose of instruction: *Provided*, That the traveling expenses herein provided for shall be in lieu of mileage and other allowances; and to provide means for the theoretical and practical instruction at the Engineer School by the purchase of text-books, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, and for other absolutely necessary expenses, \$25,000.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding, on page 42, line 19, after the word "expenses," "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay double salaries to any employee of the Engineer's School."

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I reserve the point of order to ask what the object of it is.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The object is to discourage a practice, which I am told does obtain, of paying two salaries to certain employees. For example, one employee is alleged to receive a salary, and quite a large salary to begin with, and as reimbursement for his services in a particular line of work he is assigned to in addition to that, I am informed he receives \$25 per month for certain other work, which he does not perform, but which a subordinate does, and this other man gets the salary.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I understand it is done in some of the Departments not covered by this bill. The superintendent gets \$300 extra.

Mr. SLAYDEN. This is not the superintendent.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. We decline to give it to one.

Mr. SLAYDEN. One was asked for in another school and we declined to give it.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. My understanding is that extra compensation is not carried to anyone in this bill. I have no objection to the amendment if there is any danger of somebody getting two salaries.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I am told it is an absolute fact, and I believe it to be true.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction and completion of a building for the post headquarters, engineer school, engineer library, and engineer museum, \$350,000: *Provided*, That no plans shall be adopted for the completion of the establishment of the engineer school and post at Washington Barracks, D. C., in accordance with the general lay out of the post and school which was approved by the Secretary of War on December 22, 1904, that shall require a total expenditure in excess of \$767,000, including the sum of \$350,000 hereby appropriated.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order on that paragraph, and will ask the gentleman if he will state the reason for the appropriation. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that while evidently the intention of the committee was to put a limit on the cost of this building there is no such limit in this item.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Well, there ought to be.

Mr. MANN. The item provides that plans shall not be adopted which will require a total expenditure in excess of \$767,000. That is a limitation on the War Department, but not a limitation on future appropriations by Congress at all; and, of course, practically means nothing, because if they adopt plans for a building that costs \$2,000,000 and commence the building, and come in here for an appropriation, it would not be subject to the point of order; and while the Department might be guilty of reprehensible practice, they could not tell in advance what possibly the plans might involve. It is customary to put a limit upon the cost of the building.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Very well. I think it ought to be amended in some way to absolutely limit the cost of the building. We thought we had made it so it could not exceed the appropriation. What do you suggest?

Mr. MANN. What is the necessity of this building? As I understand, they have just completed a building at the school already provided for by Congress, and what is the necessity of this?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. What is the necessity of this building?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. We have completed the building that has been appropriated for, but not this building, which is provided under the plans adopted by the War Department.

Mr. MANN. Not the building upon plans adopted by the War Department, but plans adopted by Congress.

Mr. TAWNEY. The particular building was the library and museum.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will call the attention of the gentleman to what is contained here in the hearings, and the gentleman, of course, has the estimates before him, which set out the matter pretty fully.

Mr. MANN. I will confess to the gentleman that I have not read the hearings or estimates on this subject, but I have read the report concerning this school, and from that report I can see no excuse whatever for this building.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. This is not a school entirely. It is also a place where the entire Corps of Engineers that are not on active duty, the enlisted force, and a few officers of the Engineer Corps have their barracks and quarters.

Mr. MANN. I do not understand that this is to provide barracks and quarters for the engineers. I do not know why we should have any large number of engineers here in Washington in connection with barracks and quarters. The engineers of the Army are scattered all over the country and there is a demand for them.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is the officers on river and harbor work, but the men do not go to all parts of the country, and many of the officers are here. We have here an engineer school, training the men in pontooning and the different work of the Engineer Corps, training them constantly. We have only part of the officers here, but part of them are always kept with the troops, and as those that are on river and harbor work are shifted around, their duties changing, they come to take the place of those who are here, so that there are always quite a good many officers here, and necessarily so.

Mr. MANN. I have no criticism to make of the Engineer Department of the Army. I have very great respect for that, and expect to have it as long as I have any river and harbor improvements in my district. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The hearings are quite full here as to the matter. The present engineer school building has had to be torn down, and new staff officers' quarters built there. The library building has been removed, the hospital has been removed, and they are in process of erecting the buildings to complete the plan that was provided at the time the school was moved to Washington, and this is one of the buildings. They wanted double this amount, but the committee believed we could carry on the work just as economically if we only gave part each year. In speaking of this main building, where so many different departments of the school are to be housed, I use the word "school" with the explanation that it is more than a school. There is a large detachment of troops permanently located there. The committee thought this large building was more important than any of the others that they asked for.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's appropriation bill this year carries how many million dollars more than the bill of last year?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It carries about \$7,000,000 more than it did last year.

Mr. TAWNEY. Eight million dollars more.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No; in round numbers it was \$78,000,000 last year and \$85,000,000 this year. Of course, it is increased by the action of the House on the pay of enlisted men.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That will make it \$90,000,000, will it not?

Mr. MANN. Outside of the increase in pay, for instance, as I understand, you carry about two and a half million dollars in order to get in a supply of clothing.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think that under the circumstances, with the large increase in the appropriation, they can wait another year for the commencement of a building which is not absolutely necessary, in view of the present condition of our finances?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman, of course they can wait if we do not appropriate, but Major Winslow, in command of this school here, gave a very good reason in his statement, on pages 59, 60, and 61 of the hearings, why this building at least should be built, and the committee believed it was important to commence its erection now. Of course if the

gentleman desires to strike it out, I shall be sorry, but I recognize the absolute right of the Committee of the Whole to do it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to have to differ with the chairman of the committee on any matter, for I believe that we of the Military Affairs Committee all labor in a conscientious and earnest desire to make the needful appropriations, to make them with a view to economy of the public service, and to the saving of the public moneys as far as possible.

But I can not refrain from saying that I believe this engineer school is one of the most expensive, inexcusably expensive, propositions that we have ever had. Two or three years ago I called attention to the manner in which the appropriations were secured. We first made an appropriation of \$500,000 under the impression that it would build completely and equip the building, or buildings, that would serve all the purposes of the school.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. If the gentleman from Texas will pardon me, he ought not to charge that up to the Engineer School; that is the War College and has nothing to do with the Engineer School.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I am speaking of the Engineer School. We have spent some hundred thousand dollars on this engineer school and they have eleven students.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The gentleman is mixing up the War College with the school for engineers.

Mr. SLAYDEN. How many students have they got in this engineer school?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. All the enlisted men.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Student officers?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Students stationed here, nowhere else.

Mr. SLAYDEN. We have spent \$1,010,000. The statement was made the other day that there were nine student officers, and that usually there were an average of eleven. We first made an appropriation of \$500,000.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Major Winslow stated that there were eleven at the War College.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And since then we have appropriated \$350,000 to complete it. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa if I am mistaken in these appropriations that I have named, and if they were for the War College?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The \$800,000 was for the War College. We started it at \$500,000, and supposed that that would finish it. The only thing that has to do with the Engineer School is it is to be located on the same reservation.

Mr. SLAYDEN. What is this Engineer School?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It is a collection of buildings, barracks, and quarters for the officers and men of the engineer regiment.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And it has nine student officers at this time.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The gentleman is mixing up the school with the War College. The amount appropriated here is for barracks for enlisted men and officers' quarters.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I believe that nowhere else in the world will there be found so costly a proposition as these two institutions—the Army War College and the Engineer School—have been for the Government; they are equally extravagant, inexcusably extravagant, and I think this appropriation can well wait.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman thinks that a strict construction of the rule would make this provision inadmissible. It is true there have been rulings which have stretched the rule almost to the breaking point.

The pioneer decision upon this matter was made by Mr. Cox, of New York, when presiding over the committee, something like twenty years ago, and that decision has been followed in other cases—at one time by the present occupant of the chair in a case that seemed to the Chair at the time was on all fours with the case presented at the time Mr. Cox rendered his decision; and the present occupant of the chair then stated that the decision was based entirely on the ruling of Mr. Cox. The case here presented is not on all fours, it seems to the Chair, with that case presented to Mr. Cox as chairman of the committee. It is going a step further than the rulings have heretofore gone, in the wrong direction, and the Chair thinks we have reached the limit of the elasticity of the rule, and therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Small-arms target practice; Ammunition, targets, and other accessories for small-arms and machine-gun target practice and instruction, and for the military instruction and target practice of students of educational institutions and inmates of soldiers and sailors' orphans' homes to which issues of small arms may lawfully be made; marksman's medals, prize arms, and insignia for all arms of the service, \$1,300,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the

paragraph. I would like to ask the gentleman to what extent it is expected to use \$1,300,000 in teaching the babies how to handle firearms?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I should say a small amount. We issue these obsolete guns practically to all military institutions, or institutions where they have military instruction, and to soldiers and sailors' orphans' homes. We inserted this at request of Chief of Ordnance so that they could issue ammunition fit for these guns for practice.

Mr. MANN. Is not this a new provision in the bill, "and for the military instruction and target practice of students of educational institutions?" I understand they are talking about giving Government instruction to pupils in the primary schools throughout the States as to how to use guns.

Mr. HAY. I will suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that the Chief of Ordnance stated that he had been issuing these guns heretofore, and that it had been the custom of the Department to do it; but he said there was no law for it, and he would not continue to do it unless it was placed in the bill.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The present law is "ammunition, targets, and other accessories for small-arms and machine-gun target practice and instruction."

Mr. MANN. "And for the military instruction and target practice of students of educational institutions?"

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes; from the word "instruction," where it appears in line 19, down to and including the words "may lawfully be made," in line 22, it is all new and subject to the point of order, if the gentleman insists upon it.

Mr. MANN. I shall insist upon it, unless the gentleman can give us some information.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I have very little information on the subject. They have been issuing it, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] says.

Mr. MANN. I make a point of order commencing in line 19, with the word "and," down to and including the word "made," in line 22. There is no authority of law for this, and it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

National trophy and medals for rifle contests: That for the purpose of furnishing a national trophy and medals and other prizes to be provided and contested for annually, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, said contest to be open to the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the National Guard or organized militia of the several States, Territories, and of the District of Columbia, and for the cost of the trophy, prizes, and medals herein provided for, and for the promotion of rifle practice, the sum of \$5,000, to be expended for the purposes hereinbefore prescribed under the direction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of line 14, page 46:

"Provided, That the trophies and medals herein authorized shall be contested for only by the enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the National Guard or organized militia of the several States, Territories, and of the District of Columbia."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out in line 12, page 46, the words "the sum of \$5,000." They also appear in line 14.

Mr. MANN. It ought to be out of either one line or the other.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would strike it out in the first place.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to striking out the words "the sum of \$5,000" appearing in line 12, page 46? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

For range finders and other instruments for fire control in field batteries, \$165,000.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 17, page 46, insert:

"For the purchase of material, equipment, books of instruction, range finders, and fire-control equipment, for the instruction and use of State coast artillery organizations, \$25,000."

Mr. TAWNEY. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this came to us in a supplemental estimate for the use of the militia in connection with the Coast Artillery. If it were for the Coast Artillery proper, it would undoubtedly go to the Committee on Appropriations, but the Committee on Military Affairs has had entire control of all the equipment of militia, both in its field batteries and other matters where it is to go to the militia.

Mr. TAWNEY. I shall not make a point of order on that.

As I understand it, the amendment is primarily to enable the Department to furnish the militia with the equipment necessary to the use of the range finders or fire control in the artillery practice.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Everything that makes them more efficient in cooperating with the Coast Artillery.

Mr. TAWNEY. It relates particularly to fire control, does it not?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have no objection to it, and I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whenever proposals are invited for the furnishing of articles of ordnance property the character of which or the ingredients thereof are of such a nature that the interests of the public service would be injured by publicly divulging them, the Chief of Ordnance is authorized to purchase such articles in such manner as he may deem most economical and efficient.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph. I would like to ask the gentleman some questions. It is the most startling provision I have seen for a long time, to permit any Department of the Government to expend almost any sum of money without any safeguards whatever.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I want to say to the gentleman that I regard that as the most important provision in the bill. To-day the United States Government, experimenting with high explosives has got to go into the market and advertise to the whole world all the material that enters into what we are manufacturing. No other nation on earth does that. This is to enable the Chief of Ordnance to purchase materials that enter into these high explosives without advertising to the world the line of experiment that he is indulging in.

Of course they would not know exactly how he would combine these high explosives, even if they did know what he was buying or what large quantities he was accumulating, but by their own experimentations in the same line they could very nearly duplicate our work; and I think the committee was unanimous on this, at least I have not heard of any dissent, that this one provision in the bill is of the most vital consequence to us in our preparation of high explosives and munitions of war for the national defense.

Mr. MANN. Well, that may be, in a way. I have been listening for a number of days to arguments and hearings on the subject of the transportation of high explosives. We have just reported into the House a bill giving to the Interstate Commerce Commission regulations to govern the transportation of high explosives which may require them to know of what the high explosives may consist; a bill that ought to be passed and a bill that met the approval of the War Department, by the way, as I understand. Now, you do not confine this to explosives at all. You practically say in this provision that the Chief of Ordnance may spend the entire sum of money appropriated in this bill without inviting any proposals or making public in any way what is to be purchased, and leave it solely within his control. It may be true that no other government does it.

It is undoubtedly true that there is no other government on the face of the globe where honesty is so prevalent in the purchase of public supplies as in the United States, for it is a most common thing, as we know, in a great many foreign countries for officers of the government to get a rake-off on this and a rake-off on that in the way of purchase of public supplies, and I do not want to see that occur in our Government.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman makes his point of order, I want to call attention, because it is subject to the point of order, to the language here. It says:

The character of which or the ingredients thereof are of such a nature that the interests of the public service would be injured by publicly divulging them, the Chief of Ordnance, etc.

That does not and can not apply to the matters carried in the bill generally.

Mr. MANN. Who determines that, the Auditor or the Comptroller?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The Chief of Ordnance.

Mr. MANN. And all he has to do in purchasing a gun is to certify that it is not desirable to make known the character or ingredients—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I am inclined to think if the gentleman was Secretary of War and an ordnance officer came with such a proposition to purchase a gun he would hunt up a new ordnance officer at once.

Mr. MANN. I do not know that the Secretary of War has authority to hunt up a new officer.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The President has, absolutely.

Mr. MANN. The President may have the right to designate, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, but there is nobody authorized to do it.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would like very much to have time granted by the committee to have read simply what General Crozier says in his letter on the subject, and then I am perfectly willing for it to go out on the point of order, if the gentleman desires to make it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the letter will be read. The Clerk read as follows:

General CROZIER. One of the propositions is with reference to the purchase of material when it is desired to keep such materials secret. Under the statute, as the law now exists, we have to advertise for everything, and if we want to use something of which we think the rest of the world should not know, there is no method of keeping it secret. We must advertise, and publish to the world that we want it. I have here my letter to the honorable Secretary of War explaining the whole matter, which I will insert:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, January 20, 1908.

The SECRETARY OF WAR.

SIR: I have the honor to invite your attention to the fact that this Department, in procuring ingredients for the manufacture of explosives, is at times embarrassed by reason of the fact that in advertising for proposals these ingredients are fully described, and undoubtedly can be furnished by several chemical concerns in this country. Heretofore it has been customary to procure such ingredients for explosives by circular advertisement sent to such parties only as this Department felt reasonably sure would not divulge the uses to which such ingredients might be put by the Government.

2. It has recently been held by the Comptroller of the Treasury that, when such circular advertisements are issued, a copy thereof must be posted in a public place. If such publication is resorted to it might result in the ingredients entering into explosive mixtures and compounds being known and probably foreign nations informed of the character of the explosives used by this Government. This office has in view at present the explosive used as a bursting charge for shells. The mixture of this explosive is confidential, but the ingredients are procured largely from one chemical concern in this country.

3. As the law in such cases does not relieve officers of the Government from resorting to advertisement for proposals, the following legislation is submitted to meet the requirements of the case:

"Whenever proposals are invited for the furnishing of articles of ordnance property, the character of which or the ingredients thereof are of such a nature that the interests of the public service would be injured by publicly divulging them, the Chief of Ordnance is authorized to purchase such articles in such manner as he may deem most economical and efficient."

4. In case the proposed legislation meets with your approval, it is recommended that it be forwarded for the consideration of Congress. As the Committee on Military Affairs of the House now has the Army bill under consideration, it is suggested that this communication be referred to Congress as early as practicable.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM CROZIER,
Brig. Gen., Chief of Ordnance, U. S. Army.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist upon his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill and amendments favorably to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will withhold the motion for a moment.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I will ask the chairman if he is willing now to return to the item—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman that this will go to another body which has ample power to amend the bill in that way. If there is any question about their not getting the proper pay it will be fixed.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It is not a question of proper pay. The question is, that the Comptroller has put a construction on it which was never intended by this body when the law was passed, and I would like to read the letter now, if the gentleman will yield to me—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I did not recall what the gentleman requested.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The Comptroller simply says this:

The Comptroller of the Treasury has decided, in the case of Gen. Robert J. Bates, First Brigade Michigan National Guard, that allowances for heat and light while attending service and garrison schools were not permissible under the present law—the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat., 1164), providing for subsistence, mileage, and commutation of quarters only.

That is exactly the proposition here—that commutation of quarters did not include pay for allowance for heat and light. I will ask the gentleman, therefore, not to object to our going back and amending that.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, from what I stated to the gentleman before, I will not personally object to going back for this one thing.

Mr. TAWNEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] that the committee do now rise.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have just one request. I would like to have permission to extend the remarks that I made on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the Army appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the question will be taken on the amendments in gross.

A separate vote was not demanded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, was read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

INCREASE OF NAVY.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a petition and memorial to Congress signed by certain members of faculties in universities and colleges, and educators of New York City, in opposition to the extravagant demand for \$60,000,000 to build four new battle ships, cruisers, and so forth, as an addition to the naval budget of the year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The petition and memorial are as follows:

To the Representatives and Senators in Congress:

We, the undersigned members of faculties in universities and colleges and educators of New York City, voicing, as we believe, the sentiments of many thousands of American citizens, earnestly protest against the extravagant demand for an addition of over \$60,000,000 in the form of four new battle ships, cruisers, etc., to the naval budget of last year, inasmuch as no danger threatens the country not known last April when President Roosevelt told the world: "We are no longer enlarging our Navy. We are simply keeping up its strength. The addition of one battle ship a year barely enables us to make good the units which become obsolete."

Sixty-five per cent of the national income is now expended on war, past and present. The increase of our naval budget has recently been used in the French Assembly as a reason for increasing its own; is largely responsible for the increase of armaments among Asiatic nations, and is well-nigh certain to retard that reduction in the armaments of the world for which we have so long been waiting.

The growing discontent throughout the world at the appalling increase of waste of national resources must be heeded. We feel that this protest is the more necessary inasmuch as there are various new and effective methods now available for promoting international friendship and rationally settling difficulties which these new demands seem to ignore.

William H. Maxwell, city superintendent of schools.

John H. Finley, president of the College of the City of New York.

Clarence D. Ashley, dean of the law school, New York University.

Henry W. Leppziger, supervisor of public lectures.

John Bates Clark, Columbia University.

George W. Kirchwey, dean of the law school, Columbia University.

Charles P. Fagnani, Union Theological Seminary.

Andrew W. Edson, associate city superintendent of schools.

Samuel T. Dutton, Teachers' College, Columbia University.

H. C. Bumpus, American Museum Natural History.

Frederick Dielman, College of the City of New York.

Alfred G. Compton, College of the City of New York.

James C. Egbert, Columbia University.

James Voorhees, Columbia University.

Francis H. Stoddard, New York University.

Carl Lorentzen, New York University.

James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University.

Henry R. Seager, Columbia University.

Edward L. Thorndike, Teachers' College, Columbia University.

John Dewey, Columbia University.

A. D. T. Hamlin, Columbia University.

Calvin Thomas, Columbia University.

Francis M. Burdick, Columbia University.

J. E. Spingarn, Columbia University.

J. R. Wheeler, Columbia University.

Conzalez Lodge, Teachers' College, Columbia University.

Herbert L. Osgood, Columbia University.

Joseph French Johnson, New York University.

D. W. Hering, New York University.

Arthur B. Lamb, New York University.
 Dr. Henry G. Piffard, Columbia University.
 Charles Lane Poor, Columbia University.
 Louis Celamarre, College of the City of New York.
 George C. Scott, College of the City of New York.
 William J. Brewster, Columbia University.
 William G. McGuckin, College of the City of New York.
 Anna M. Olsson, principal Public School 141, Brooklyn.
 George Meason Whiteher, Normal College.
 Hiram H. Bice.
 Eugene H. Pool, M. D., Columbia University.
 F. W. Osborn, Adelphi College.
 James C. Reynolds.
 Edwin A. Greenlaw, Adelphi College.
 Ellen Murray, Public School 38, Bronx.
 Annie J. Farley, Public School 183.
 Isabel D. Fisher, Adelphi College.
 Agnes E. De Monde, principal Public School 116, Brooklyn.
 Kate S. Anthony, Horace Mann School.
 C. F. Chandler, Columbia University.
 May F. M. Aleer, principal Public School 188.
 Charles A. Beard, Columbia University.
 Ernest Ilgen, College of the City of New York.
 A. Beatrice Beard, Adelphi College.
 W. E. Waters, New York University.
 Ida Ikeller, Public School 68.
 C. L. Speranza, Columbia University.
 Frederick L. Ludgauer, principal Public School 152, Brooklyn.
 Mrs. Maria Kraus-Buelte, Kraus' Seminary for Kindergarteners.
 Mary C. Bergen, Public School 73.
 K. R. Brady, Public School 151, Brooklyn.
 Charles Perrine, principal Public School 110, Brooklyn.
 Eliza S. Pell, principal Public School 96.
 M. A. Regan, Public School 107.
 A. B. Turner, College of the City of New York.
 Joseph Allen, College of the City of New York.
 Samuel Newman, College of the City of New York.
 J. H. Grotecloss, Public School 11.
 Margaretta Uehlein, Public School 54.
 Henry C. Pearson, Teachers' College.
 Gustave Le Gros, College of the City of New York.
 Emma S. Saudrine, Public School 93.
 Jeannette S. Sewett, Normal College.
 Graham Lusk, New York University.
 Henry Edward Crampton, Columbia University.
 William M. Campbell, New York University.
 Joseph S. Taylor, district superintendent of schools.
 Elizabeth A. Duggan, Public School 57.
 M. B. Coles, Normal College.
 Cecile Freese, Horace Mann School.
 Edmund Burke, College of the City of New York.
 Ellen M. Phillips, principal Public School 131.
 J. G. Bowtell, Normal College.
 Royal Whitman, Columbia University.
 A. G. Jacob, Jamaica High School.
 H. F. Walker, Columbia University.
 G. M. Swift, Columbia University.
 George N. Boardman, Columbia University.
 Edwin C. Broome, Adelphi College.
 A. Henry Grant, Jersey City High School.
 Samuel Ayers, Public School 132.
 J. C. Gordy, New York University.
 Caroline Emanuel, Public School 50.
 Charles C. Roberts, Public School 25.
 Emma L. Johnston, Brooklyn Training School.
 M. A. Bigelow, Teachers' College, Columbia University.
 Isabella Sullivan, Public School 170.
 Maurice J. Thompson, Public School 6.
 M. Allen Starr, Columbia University.
 William E. Grady, Public School 64.
 Ellen T. O'Brien, Public School 36.
 Kate M. Falvey, Public School 78.
 Jessie Ashley, New York University.
 Jennie Birmingham, Public School 90.
 Charles Bikle, Horace Mann School.
 George Philip Krapp, Columbia University.
 Augusta L. Cassidy, Public School 49.
 Benjamin Veit, Public School 1.
 William B. Coley, Columbia University.
 M. B. Barringer, Public School 39.
 Teresa C. Burke, Public School 121.
 Downing Bain, New York University.
 Clara American, Public School 127.
 Gertrude Hirst, Columbia University.
 William N. Story, Public School 34.
 Elizabeth J. Hofer, Public School 174.
 William J. O'Leary, Public School 5, Brooklyn.
 Elizabeth V. Gaines, Adelphi College.
 John F. Reigart, principal School 2.
 Emma Sylvester, principal Public School 35.
 Paul Monroe, Teachers' College.
 V. E. Kilpatrick, principal Public School 52.
 Millicent Baum, principal Public School 168.
 William L. Ettinger, Public School 147.
 Isaac Price, Public School 65b.
 Olivia J. Hall, Public School 157.
 James Sullivan, Boys' High School, Brooklyn.
 Charles J. Pickett, principal Public School 26, Bronx.
 Margaret E. Maltby, Barnard College.
 H. M. C. Vedder, New York University.
 William L. Fuller, Girls' High School.
 Charles Gray Shaw, New York University.
 J. F. Kemp, Columbia University.
 Florence M. Marshall, Horace Mann School.
 W. L. Bulkley, principal Public School 80.
 F. M. McMurtry, Teachers' College, Columbia University.
 William E. B. Starkweather, College of the City of New York.
 John F. Harris, principal Public School 95.
 M. F. O'Connell, principal Public School 31.
 Jennie M. Tower, principal Public School 114.
 Sadia E. Baird, Public School 48.
 Helena A. Hulskamp, Elementary School 63.
 Mary L. Brady, Public School 177.
 Florence E. Viet, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn.

Mary A. Willis, Packer Collegiate Institute.
 John F. Woodhull, Columbia University.
 M. Adelaide Nutting, Teachers' College, Columbia University.
 George N. Olcott, Columbia University.
 Charles P. Berkey, Columbia University.
 Julia Emery Turner, Packer Collegiate Institute.
 E. L. Kuntz, Columbia University.
 Joseph E. Messenger, New York.
 Clarence H. Young, Columbia University.
 Edith C. Squires, Packer Collegiate Institute.
 E. Kelly, Public School 87, Brooklyn.
 Lyman A. Best, Public School 108.
 John J. Wells, Public School 35, Brooklyn.
 M. D. Batchelder, Horace Mann School.
 E. G. Sihler, New York University.
 F. A. Irvine, Public School 68, Brooklyn.
 Elenore E. Elliott, Public School 57.
 Catherine P. Candler, Normal College.
 E. Aubert, Normal College.
 Herbert G. Lord, Columbia University.
 Laura B. Collier, Packer Collegiate Institute.
 E. F. Nichols, Columbia University.
 Robert Peele, Columbia University.
 Virgil Prettyman, Horace Mann School.
 Thomas C. Baker, Public School 44, Brooklyn.
 Bernard J. Devlin, Public School 13, Bronx.
 M. E. Quinn, Public School 125.
 Ella Keith, Normal College.
 Kathleen M. Kullen, Public School 66, Brooklyn.
 Margaret S. Winslow, Public School 18, Brooklyn.
 Harriet L. Bogue, Public School 55, Brooklyn.
 Gertrude E. Hale, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn.
 Julia B. Anthony, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn.
 Emily H. Welch, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn.
 Edwin B. Uline, Public School 27.
 Mary Walsemair, Public School 8, Brooklyn.
 Matilda C. Skine, Public School 20, Brooklyn.
 M. W. Kennerly, Normal College.
 M. J. Merritt, Public School 29, Brooklyn.
 Joseph C. Pfister, Columbia University.
 Mary A. Regan, Public School 31, Bronx.
 William P. McCarthy, Public School 42, Bronx.
 Mary C. V. Connolly, Public School 113.
 L. A. McLauth, New York University.
 Channing Rudd, New York University.
 Charles C. Holden, Public School 17, Bronx.
 James S. C. Wells, Columbia University.
 James C. Rogers, Public School 128, Brooklyn.
 Olin Cartridge, Horace Mann School.
 Elizabeth F. Doherty, Public School 42, Brooklyn.
 Henry C. Sherman, Columbia University.
 Miss Miriam Werner, Normal College, New York.
 William Fox, The College of the City of New York.
 Priscilla Fletcher, Normal College.
 Henry E. Bliss, College of the City of New York.
 C. Howard Parmly, College of the City of New York.
 Sarah Goldie, Public School 190.
 Kate M. Stephens, Public School 135.
 Walter W. Arnold, Horace Mann School.
 Ida E. Robins, Teachers College, Columbia University.
 Elizabeth M. Wheelock, Horace Mann School.
 Edmund M. Foote, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University.
 John S. Fitzpatrick, Public School 81, Brooklyn.
 Augusta Beck, Public School 88, Brooklyn.
 Kate Van Wagenen, Public School 2, Bronx.
 Andrew E. Eichman, Public School 97, Brooklyn.
 James E. Lough, New York University.
 Louise Castle, Public School 92, Brooklyn.
 Edward Bush, Public School 18, Brooklyn.
 Curtis Claassen, New York University and Bellevue Hospital Medical College.
 Leslie J. Tompkins, New York University Law School.
 Gorham Bacon, Columbia University.
 Carlos F. MacDonald, University and Bellevue Medical College.
 Barclay W. Bradley, College of the City of New York.
 Edward Mandell, Public School 188.
 Mary A. Mason, Public School 79, Brooklyn.
 Moses Becker, jr., Public School 118, Brooklyn.
 Kate Morgan Ward, Packer Collegiate Institute.
 Fred H. Sykes, Columbia University.
 F. N. Cole, Columbia University.
 David Sneddon, Columbia University.
 Allan Abbott, Horace Mann School.
 C. M. Baker, Horace Mann School.
 Adolph Werner, College of the City of New York.
 Emory B. Lease, College of the City of New York.
 Marie-Louise Raoux, Normal College.
 Mary Amelia Sheldon, Normal College.
 Lewis F. Mott, College of the City of New York.
 Charles A. Downer, College of the City of New York.
 Marion S. Coan, Normal College.
 Susan E. Van Wert, Normal College.
 Thomas J. Meighan, Public School 27, Bronx.
 L. G. Simmons, Normal College.
 A. Wadsworth, Columbia University.
 Frederica J. Constantini, Normal College.
 Margaret Laing, Public School 117, Brooklyn.
 Henry G. Kost, College of the City of New York.
 Joseph G. Furey, Public School 123, Brooklyn.
 Lilla A. Nourse, Columbia University.
 Jefferson B. Fletcher, Columbia University.
 Herbert M. Richards, Barnard College.
 Marie H. Brooks, Horace Mann School.
 John King Clark, Public School 23, Bronx.
 Roland H. Williams, Horace Mann School.
 Frank E. Brooks, Horace Mann School.
 A. L. McDevitt, Public School 61, Brooklyn.
 Maud V. Keyes, Horace Mann School.
 Charles D. Raine, principal Public School 147.
 Winifred T. Cullen, Public School 56.
 E. G. Bridgman, Public School 111.
 Lillian E. Rogers, Horace Mann School.
 Mary E. O'Donnell, Public School 90, Brooklyn.

C. C. Calkins, Public School 6, Brooklyn.
 M. Louise Rockwood, Public School 46, Brooklyn.
 Honor E. Quinn, Public School 63, Brooklyn.
 Lizzie F. Spafford, Public School 161.
 C. F. Kayser, Normal College.
 James T. Shorwell, Columbia University.
 Eugenie C. Levie, Public School 124.
 Walter B. James, Columbia University.
 Isabella F. Wright, Public School 104.
 N. B. Foster, Columbia University.
 L. G. Forward, Bellevue Hospital Medical School.
 Prince A. Movine, Bellevue Hospital Medical School.
 Mary S. Woolman, Teachers' College, Columbia University.
 Oliver C. Mordock, Public School 10, Brooklyn.
 Marion Clarey, Public School 19.
 Robert F. Smith, College of the City of New York.
 Dorothy C. Hess, Normal College.
 Mary G. Peabody, Horace Mann School.
 H. H. Presby, New York College of Pharmacy.
 Edward S. Page, Public School 77.
 Margaret Knox, Public School 15.
 J. Loaz, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn.
 Freda M. Brunn, Adelphi College, Brooklyn.
 Eugenie Menut, Horace Mann School.
 Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York.
 Linneas E. La Ferra, Columbia University.
 L. Emmett Holt, Columbia University.
 Charles P. Warren, Columbia University.
 Emma J. MacAlarney, Horace Mann School.
 J. D. Miller.
 Charles F. Horne, College of the City of New York.
 Frank Rollins, The Stuyvesant High School.
 Leon Brummer, New York University.
 Nathan Abbott, Columbia University.
 George T. Holm, Columbia University.
 N. Louise Roethgen, Adelphi College, Brooklyn.
 Phillip D. Kurrison, University, Bellevue Medical School.
 Franz Boas, Columbia University.
 Carl Leonardo Speranza, Columbia University.
 Frederick H. Wilkens, New York University.
 Rudolph M. Binder, New York University.
 Helen H. Tanzer, Normal College of the City of New York.
 Mary J. McHench, principal Public School 114, Brooklyn.
 Margaret M. Slattey, principal Public School 53, New York City.
 Eliza A. Caterson, Public School 21, New York City.
 Julia C. Cremins, New York University.
 Amanda C. Northrop, Normal College.
 Jesse H. Bigham, Department of Manual Training, New York City.
 Mabel L. Chesley, Erasmus High School, New York City.
 Arthur Schultze, New York University.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR HOMESTEAD ENTRYMEN.

Mr. PRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 14043, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14043) to provide for the extension of time within which homestead entrymen may establish their residence upon certain lands within the limits of the Huntley Irrigation project, in the county of Yellowstone, in the State of Montana.

Be it enacted, etc., That the homestead entrymen on lands within the limits of the Huntley Irrigation project, in the county of Yellowstone, in the State of Montana, opened to entry July 22, 1907, be, and they are hereby, granted an extension of time in which to establish their residence upon the lands so opened and filed upon until the 15th day of May, 1908: *Provided, however,* That this act shall in no manner affect the regularity or validity of such filings, or any of them, so made by the said entrymen on the lands aforesaid; and it is only intended hereby to extend the time for the establishment of such residence as herein provided.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if this is a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. PRAY. This is a unanimous report from the Committee on the Public Lands, and it also has the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PRAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

UNLAWFUL OCCUPANCY OF PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. PRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 3941.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 3941) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act to prevent unlawful occupancy of the public lands," approved February 25, 1885.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of an act entitled "An act to prevent unlawful occupancy of the public lands," approved February 25, 1885, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. That any person violating any of the provisions hereof, whether as owner, part owner, or agent, or who shall aid, abet, counsel, advise, or assist in any violation hereof, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and fined in a sum not exceeding \$1,000, or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, for each offense."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was read a third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. PRAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same.

H. R. 17227. An act to authorize the city of St. Joseph, Mich., to construct a bridge across the St. Joseph River at or near its mouth.

BRIDGE ACROSS ROCK RIVER, COLONA FERRY, ILLINOIS.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 17422) to authorize the counties of Henry and Rock Island, in the State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in said State.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 17422) to authorize the counties of Henry and Rock Island, in the State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in said State.

Be it enacted, etc., That the counties of Henry and Rock Island, in the State of Illinois, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois if this is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. PRINCE. It is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And the bill is drawn in accordance with the general law governing the construction of bridges across navigable streams?

Mr. PRINCE. It is.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

BIOLOGICAL AND FISH-CULTURAL STATION, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, IOWA.

Mr. GREENE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from further consideration of the bill H. R. 13659 and that it be recommitted to the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts, by direction of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, asks unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the consideration of the bill, the title of which the Clerk will report, and that the same be recommitted to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13659) to establish a biological and fish-cultural station in the Second Congressional District of the State of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

UNPAID HAWAIIAN POSTAL SAVINGS-BANK DEPOSITS.

Mr. DRAPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11560) relating to unpaid Hawaiian Postal Savings Bank deposits.

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever, by reason of the death of any person and the want of an executor or administrator, any demand for moneys deposited in the Hawaiian Postal Savings Bank can not be certified to by the governor of Hawaii as provided in section 102 of "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, the governor may, upon written application, certify to such demand as due to the persons satisfactorily proved to him to be the persons who would be entitled to the personal estate of the decedent by the terms of the laws of Hawaii relating to the distribution of estate of intestates, and his certificate so made, when sealed, countersigned, and approved as provided in said section for other certificates shall have the same force and effect as such other certificates.

SEC. 2. That all claims to moneys deposited in the Hawaiian Postal Savings Bank not presented for certification as provided by law within two years after the passage of this act shall be forever barred.

SEC. 3. That when all claims certified as provided by law have been paid the Secretary of the Interior shall draw his warrant for the balance, if any, of the Hawaiian Postal Savings Bank deposits then remaining unpaid upon the Treasurer of the United States payable to the treasurer of the Territory of Hawaii, who shall thereupon apply the same toward the payment of the public debt of Hawaii, in conformity with the provisions of the "Joint resolution to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States," approved July 7, 1898.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Reserving the right to object, I do not precisely understand this. It seems to be a somewhat complicated matter. Is this a payment out of the United States Treasury or is it a payment out of the Hawaiian treasury?

Mr. DRAPER. This relates to a sum of \$2,244.74 unpaid deposits in the Hawaiian Postal Savings Bank. This is to authorize the governor to certify to the heirs—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that. How does this money get there?

Mr. DRAPER. Why, it is a balance of money in the Hawaiian Postal Savings Bank.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then why was the money paid into the Treasury from the Postal Savings Bank?

Mr. DRAPER. It was money that was in the savings bank seven years ago when the bank commenced to liquidate, and this is the balance on hand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, what I am getting at is this: This comes out of the funds of the Hawaii Savings Bank and is not paid out of the Treasury?

Mr. DRAPER. That is right.

Mr. DALZELL. It is not public money at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and being engrossed it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Ammon F. Lindley, administrator of estate of Martha W. Lindley, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Merit F. Thomas against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Jane S. Bishop, administratrix of estate of E. W. Bishop, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GREGG, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 305) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the Hospital Corps of the United States Navy, and regulate its pay, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1122), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4063) for the widening of Benning road, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1123), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FOSTER of Indiana, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16269) authorizing the extension of Ninth street NW., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1124), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17303) authorizing the extension of Girard street NW. from its western terminus to Fifteenth street NW., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1125), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FOWLER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12677) to establish a simple and scientific monetary system, founded

upon gold, guaranteed bank notes, and silver, with uniform banking and bank reserves in gold coin or its equivalent; to guarantee all deposits and note issues, and to fix certain rules and regulations whereby the financial operations of the Government shall cease to be a disturbing factor in our trade and commerce, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1126), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15230) to amend an act approved February 28, 1901, entitled "An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia," reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1128), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15231) to amend the license law approved July 1, 1902, with respect to licenses of drivers of passenger vehicles for hire, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1129), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17979) requiring common carriers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce to make full reports of all accidents to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and authorizing investigations thereof by said Commission, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1130), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14549) granting a pension to Benjamin C. Durham, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 18442) to provide for the purchase of ground for and the erection of a public building for an immigration station, on a site to be selected for such station in the city of Baltimore, State of Maryland—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 18443) authorizing a resurvey of certain townships in the State of Wyoming—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 18444) to provide for the extension of S street NW. from Second street to Third street, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DALZELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 18445) to investigate and develop methods of treatment of tuberculosis—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 18446) forbidding the importation, exportation, or carriage in interstate commerce of gold-filled or gold-plated watch cases bearing words or marks importing a guaranty of wear for a specified time, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 18447) to establish a sub-treasury at Kansas City, Kans.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 18448) for the erection of a public building at Faribault, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18449) to provide for a survey for the improvement of the navigation of the Minnesota River and for the removal of the dam from the mouth of said river—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 18450) authorizing the construction of a railroad bridge over the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 18451) increasing the limit of cost of a public building at Toledo, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 18452) to provide for the erection of a public building at Searcy, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 18453) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Danbury, in the State of Connecticut—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 18454) for the erection of a public building at San Marcos, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to create a commission to inquire into the practicability of acquiring Government ownership of and preserving as public grounds the estate known as Monticello, in Virginia, home of Thomas Jefferson—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Distribution of House Rooms: Resolution (H. Res. 269) for the further assignment of House Office Building rooms—to the House Calendar.

By Mr. SCOTT: Resolution (H. Res. 270) for additional pay for the clerk to Committee on Agriculture—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FORDNEY: Resolution (H. Res. 271) for assignment of a janitor to room 503 in the Congressional Office Building—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Memorial of the legislature of Oklahoma, asking Congress to grant to the settlers of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian reservations in Oklahoma, free homes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Memorial of the legislature of Florida, asking Congress to pass a law requiring the War Department to furnish the adjutant-general of Florida a list of soldiers from that State who served in the various wars of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 18455) granting an increase of pension to George W. Frazier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 18456) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Armstrong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18457) granting an increase of pension to Jane Lupton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 18458) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 18459) to correct the military record of W. H. Newman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 18460) granting an increase of pension to Curtis G. Bagwell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18461) to pay Brewer & Patterson, or the survivors thereof, for cotton taken during the civil war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 18462) to issue patents in fee simple for and to remove the restrictions upon the alienation of lands allotted to Lan-e-pe-shaw, or Frank Beaver, and others, members of the Peoria tribe of Indians in Oklahoma—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 18463) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Trumble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 18464) granting an increase of pension to Charles O. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 18465) for the relief of Rufus L. King—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 18466) granting an increase of pension to Leander F. Merrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 18467) granting an increase of pension to Alphonzo N. Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 18468) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18469) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Whitsett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18470) granting a pension to James G. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 18471) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Morgan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILL of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 18472) granting a pension to John Chatman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 18473) for the relief of A. V. Coles—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMAR of Florida: A bill (H. R. 18474) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Crosby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18475) granting an increase of pension to William Geddes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18476) granting a pension to William A. Lee—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18477) granting a pension to William Barnett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18478) granting a pension to Emma C. Theinlin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18479) for the relief of Sarah E. Callahan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 18480) for the relief of the heirs of William O'Bryant—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 18481) for the relief of the estate of Major E. Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 18482) for the relief of A. P. Sparkman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 18483) granting a pension to Ida S. Conway—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18484) for the relief of Jeanie G. Lyles—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 18485) to complete the military record of William M. Burrows—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 18486) granting a pension to R. D. Fleming—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 18487) for the relief of Charles H. Dunning—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 18488) for the relief of George T. Larkin—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 18489) for the relief of Walter T. Dough—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18490) for the relief of Hannah B. Sabiston—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18491) for the relief of the estate of D. L. Pritchard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18492) to correct the military record of Wiley W. Woolard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18493) granting a pension to Emma Swanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18494) for the relief of the estate of Esau Berry, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 18495) granting an increase of pension to Edward Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 18496) for the relief of James W. Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18497) for the relief of Robert B. Watson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18498) for the relief of Jacob H. Mays—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18499) for the relief of the heirs of Elias E. Blackburn, late marshal of the northern district of Florida—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 18500) to authorize the issuance of a patent to William Gibson for land located in Choctaw County, State of Alabama—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 18501) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joseph White, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 18502) granting an increase of pension to James R. Candle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18503) granting an increase of pension to Joshua G. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 18504) granting an increase of pension to James B. Waters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLACE: A bill (H. R. 18505) for the relief of Rebecca Walthall, widow, and the heirs of John Walthall, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 18506) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 18507) granting an increase of pension to James A. Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18508) granting an increase of pension to Caldwell G. Byers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18509) granting an increase of pension to Charles Dalrymple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Petition of New York Board of Trade and Transportation, for appropriation for a seagoing tug for rescue work off Point Judith (previously referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRICK: Petition of Plumbers' Union No. 172, of Indiana, for battle-ship construction in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of C. C. Harvey, of Fort Fairfield, Me., against order of Postmaster-General relative to credit subscriptions—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Honesty Grange, No. 83, of Morrill, Me., for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of United States and Canada, Branch No. 31, of Spring City, Pa., against S. 2926 (Tillman bill)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of James Ledom, jr., of Media, Pa., for S. 3152 (protection of dairy interests)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of International Stereotypers and Electrotypers' Local Union No. 1, of New York, for removal of duty on white paper and wood pulp, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: Petitions of Grand Army of the Republic posts in the following towns of Illinois: Clay City, No. 269; Chicago, Nos. 740, 444, and 91; Jacksonville, No. 328; Galena, No. 502; Pontiac, No. 105; Springfield, No. 30; Newton, No. 550; Rockwood, No. 734, and Sparta, No. 181, for a volunteer officers' retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of Henry Concklin Post, No. 171, Grand Army of the Republic, of East Troy, Wis., against abolition of pension agencies—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of Board of Trade of Apalachicola, Fla., favoring action of National Rivers and Harbors Congress relative to improvement of waterways—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Jacksonville Credit Men's Association, favoring the passage of H. R. 13266, relative to bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Lumber Dealers' Association of Connecticut, for forest reservations in White Mountains and southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition of Lumber Dealers' Association of Connecticut, for forest reservations in White Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of Local Union No. 1, of International Stereotypers and Electrotypers, of New York, for removal of duty on white paper, wood pulp, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of educators of New York City, against increase of Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DUREY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Elmira Ames—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles O. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Shull—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Alphonzo N. Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of F. W. Chickering, for a volunteer officers' retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of National Guards of New York, for H. R. 14783 and S. 4316, for improvement of the militia—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 1, International Stereotypers and Electrotypers, for removal of duty on white paper and wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Petition of I. O. Striker and 39 others, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Enoch Wimberly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEFLIN: Senate joint resolution of State of Alabama, according the Hon. Jabez Lamar Monroe Curry the tribute of a statue in the national Statuary Hall—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James W. Crook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Frederick C. Lang, of Hoboken, N. J., for H. R. 15004, granting American register to steamship *Eva*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, of Seattle, Wash., for closing gates of Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition on Sundays—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of F. E. Coolidge and others, of Everett, Wash., for adequate and effective Asiatic-exclusion laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Grace Methodist Episcopal Church and Madison Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Seattle, Wash., against sale of intoxicating liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Paper to accompany bill for relief of A. C. Coles—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of soldier citizens of La Plata, Mo., for increase of pensions for all soldiers to \$20 per month and for all widows of soldiers to \$12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MALBY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of N. M. Curtis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Boston Architectural Club, of Boston, Mass., favoring plan of Park Commission for the improvement of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of Local Union No. 1, International Stereotypers and Electrotypers, of New York, for removal of duty on white paper and wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles E. Davis, of the National Guard Association, State of New York, favoring S. 4316 and H. R. 14783, amending militia act of January 21, 1903—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of educators of New York City, against increase of Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of Merchants' Association of New York, against the Aldrich currency bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of drug trade secretary of New York Board of Trade and Transportation, against S. 42 and 3043 and H. R. 6089—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of national convention of the unemployed, for appropriation of \$150,000,000 for improvement of waterways—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Chicago Federation of Labor, for H. R. 15123 and S. 4395 (investigation of telegraph companies)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Buffalo Lodge, No. 12, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, for S. 4260 (Clapp free-pass amendment)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of North Hudson Ministerial Association, of Hudson County, N. J., representing churches with 5,000 members, for the Sims prohibitory bill (H. R. 9086)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petition of Benjamin M. Caldwell, favoring parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Washington County Union, of the National Educational and Cooperative Union of America, for legislation improving our banking laws—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Central Trades and Labor Assembly, of Tampa, Fla., for battle-ship construction in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of educators of the city of New York, against increase of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of W. D. Hamilton, of Columbus, Ohio, for a volunteer officers' retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALLACE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George W. Robinson—to the Committee on Pensions.